

Cardinal Johannes B. Franzelin, S.J.

On the Procession of the Holy Spirit

Supplementum to De Deo Trino

Gpt-5 Translation

ON THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

GPT-5 TRANSLATION

ONE THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF MACARIUS BULGAKOV, METROPOLITAN OF THE RUSSIAN SCHISMATICS, & JOSEPH LANGEN, NEO-PROTESTANT OF BONN

A SUPPLEMENT TO THE TREATISE ON THE MOST HOLY TRINITY

AUTHORED BY THE REV. CARDINAL JOHANNES BAPTIST FRANZELIN, S.J.

FROM THE LATIN PUBLISHED IN PRATO
BY GIACHETTI, FILII & C.
1894

IN MEMORY OF CARDINAL JOHANNES BAPTIST
FRANZELIN, OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS

Table of Contents

	Examination of Macarius Bulgakov	
Section I.	On The Macarian Interpretation Of Scriptural Passages	1
Chapter I.	On The Hermeneutical Principles Of Macarius, By Which The Very Dogma Of The Eternal Procession Of The Holy Spirit From The Father Is Called Into Question	2
Chapter II.	On The Proof Of The Photian Doctrine From Scripture Presented By Macarius	9
§ I.	On The Testimony Of Christ In John 15:26	13
§ II.	On Procession As The Root Of Mission	25
§ III.	Concerning The Divine Person Who Receives From Another Person	55
§ IV.	On The Relation By Which The Spirit Is, And Is Called, The Spirit Of The Son	70
§ V.	On The Doctrine Of The Fathers And Theologians From The Action Of Christ (John 20:22)	74
Section II.	On The Sophistries By Which, In Defense Of The Photian Doctrine, An Appeal Is Made To The Documents Of Ecclesiastical Preaching	80

CONTENTS

Chapter I.	On The Alleged Proof Of The Photian Doctrine From The Creeds Of Faith	81
Chapter II.	On The Same Alleged Proof From The Doctrine Of The Councils	88
§ I.	On The Seven Councils Held In The East	89
§ II.	On The Councils Of Toledo And Of Aachen	99
Chapter III.	On The Testimonies Of The Holy Fathers Who Taught That The Holy Spirit Proceeds From The Father Alone	116
§ I.	On The Doctrine, In General, Of The Fathers Who Are Brought Forward	117
§ II.	On Macarius's Division Of The Fathers Into Four Classes, And On Certain Errors Incidentally Noted	123
§ III.	On The So-Called Photian Doctrine Said To Have Prevailed In The Ninth Century Within The Western Church Itself	137
§ IV.	On The Macarian Argument, By Which He Attempts To Prove That By The Affirmation Of Procession From The Father The Negation Of Procession From The Son Is Signified	148
§ V.	A Compendium Of Catholic Doctrine In The Principal Greek Fathers Who Are Cited In Favor Of The Photian Doctrine	156
§ VI.	The Testimonies Adduced By Macarius From These Same Fathers Are Examined	171
§ VII.	On The Remaining Greek Doctors Who Are Brought Forward For An Explicit Denial Of A Procession From The Son	198
§ VIII.	On The Western Fathers Who Are Cited As If They Were Explicit Vindicators Of The Photian Doctrine	206

Section III.	On The Profession Of The Procession From The Father And The Son As Expressed In The Creed	213
Chapter I.	On The Catholic Testimonies Adduced By Macarius	219
Chapter II.	On Macarius's Argument From The Statutes Of The Photian Synod	243
Section IV.	On The Accusations Of Macarius Against Catholic Theologians	270
Chapter I.	On The Theological Arguments Of Macarius Against Catholic Theology	270
Chapter II.	On The Corruptions Of Texts That The Photians Charge Against Latin Theologians	282

Scholia on Joseph Langen

Chapter I.	A Summary Of The Neophotian Disquisition	306
Chapter II.	Langen's Concealment And Distortion Of The Testimonies Of Scripture	312
Chapter III.	The Neophotian Perversion Of The Doctrine Of The Fathers	326
§ I.	Denial Of The Catholic Principle Of Tradition	326
§ II.	The Distinction Introduced By Langen Between Procession From The Son And Through The Son	330
§ III.	Langen's Admission Regarding The Consensus Of The Fathers On The Doctrine Of The Procession Through The Son Or From The Son	340
§ IV.	The Fallacy Of The Neo-Protestants Concerning The Origin Of The Catholic Consensus In Doctrine Of Faith	350

§ V.	Concealment Of The Documents Of Antiquity In Which The Article Of Faith Is Expressly Affirmed	355
§ VI.	The Neophotian Twisting Of The Unanimous Doctrine Of The Fathers By A Fallacious Comparison Of Passages	363
§ VII.	A Synthesis Of The Entire "Langenian" Inquiry Composed By The Author Himself	384

PREFACE

This translation of On the Procession of the Holy Spirit, taken from Cardinal John Baptist Franzelin's Examination of the Doctrine of Macarius Bulgakov and Joseph Langen, is presented as a resource for students and scholars of Catholic theology who wish to engage directly with one of the most rigorous nineteenth-century treatments of Trinitarian doctrine.

Originally published in Latin in 1894 at Prato by Giachetti, Sons & Company, this work represents a mature expression of Roman scholastic theology at the close of the nineteenth century. Franzelin (1816–1886), Jesuit professor of dogmatic theology at the Roman College and later cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, was among the most influential theologians of the First Vatican Council. His careful exposition of the Filioque and his polemical engagement with contemporary opponents demonstrate both the scholastic precision of the Roman school and its fidelity to the Catholic magisterium.

In this treatise Franzelin addresses two figures in particular. Macarius Bulgakov (1816–1882), Metropolitan of Moscow, was the leading Russian Orthodox dogmatic theologian of his time, whose multivolume Orthodox Dogmatic Theology mounted a systematic rejection of the Catholic teaching on the procession of the Holy

Spirit. Joseph Langen (1837–1901), professor at the University of Bonn, aligned with the Old Catholic movement after the First Vatican Council and advanced a rationalist biblical theology deeply marked by liberal Protestant influence. Franzelin's refutation of their positions, while responding to immediate controversies, also extends and supplements his own Treatise on the Most Holy Trinity.

This edition has been produced with the assistance of two Artificial Intelligence models namely: Sonnet 4 and Gpt-5, from the 1894 Latin edition. Effort has been made to preserve Franzelin's precision of terminology while rendering the work in clear modern English. Citations and footnotes have been translated in full, though Greek and Latin source texts are retained in the original language. Readers seeking exact verification are encouraged to consult the Latin edition.

PROLOGUE

TO THE EXAMINATION OF THE RUSSIAN BISHOP MACARIUS BULGAKOV

When I first wrote about the procession of the Holy Spirit in Section III of the Treatise on the Most Holy Trinity, I had not yet seen the book of Macarius Bulgakov (1), the Russian schismatic, in which he undertook to attack the article of revealed faith concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, and to persuade others of this negation as if it were a dogma of faith. The author does not, indeed, introduce new arguments, but repeats and suitably adorns all the former distortions that have passed into the very marrow of schismatic theology since the time of that remarkable deceiver Photius, in order to impose upon the ignorance of his followers and to strengthen in their heresy those who have already

---

[1] Dogmatic Orthodox Theology by Macarius, Doctor of Theology, Bishop of Vinnitza, Rector of the Ecclesiastical Academy of Saint Petersburg, translated by a Russian. Paris 1860. He has a treatise on the Procession of the Holy Spirit, Vol. I, pp. 325-423. Introduction to Orthodox Theology by Macarius, etc. Paris 1857. On the Procession of the Holy Spirit, pp. 574-590. The work was deemed worthy of a first-class prize by the Academy of Sciences of Saint Petersburg.

been raised in it. Although in our Treatise itself the reasons for detecting these frauds and explaining these Macarian entanglements seem to me to have been abundantly declared, nevertheless I have thought it worthwhile to examine each of the man's fallacies in detail and to dispel the shadows that this impostor has heaped first upon the testimonies of Scripture, and then upon the doctrine of the Councils and the holy Fathers, both Western and Eastern, in order to obscure and remove from sight the splendor of the entire manifest tradition. First, therefore, I will speak about what he advances against Scripture, and afterward I will expose the frauds constructed from other documents. I will conduct this entire investigation and refutation in such a way that I will presuppose throughout the demonstrations introduced in my Treatise on the Most Holy Trinity, second edition, and I will also frequently refer the reader to the Theses of the same Treatise, to which I intend this present Examination of Macarius's doctrine to be merely a supplement, and that entirely polemical.

SECTION I.

ON THE MACARIAN INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES

Macarius teaches two things: that the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father is clearly contained in the Scriptures; and that the procession from the Son as from the Father is not contained in them. Yet in Thesis XXXIX of the Treatise on the Trinity, I observed —and the matter is clear in itself—that even if both of these were conceded, it would by no means follow that the Photian doctrine is true and the Catholic doctrine false. To demonstrate this, it would be necessary to find in the testimony of the Scriptures a negation of the procession from the Son, since it is not the affirmation of procession from the Father (which all Catholics have always confessed and continue to confess) but this negation that constitutes the dogma by which the Photians separate themselves from the Catholic Church. Nor indeed could the Photians, merely because the Catholic profession concerning procession from the Son is not found recorded in the Scriptures, consider the falsity of this doctrine or the truth of their own demonstrated, unless they wish to abandon their own principles in favor of Protestant principles, which, denying tradition, state that no dogmas are to be believed except those expressed in the

Scriptures. However, we cannot be content with this kind of argumentum ad hominem, as they call it; rather, our intention is to examine more distinctly the individual fallacies by which the Photian perverts the meaning of the Scriptures. For from this it will already now appear—what will be most abundantly clear throughout this entire investigation of ours—how perversely and impiously the entire revealed doctrine concerning the most august mystery of the Trinity is distorted in the Photian heresy.

CHAPTER I.
ON THE HERMENEUTICAL PRINCIPLES OF MACARIUS, BY WHICH THE VERY DOGMA OF THE ETERNAL PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT FROM THE FATHER IS CALLED INTO QUESTION

Although Macarius with the rest of the Photians certainly admits and most strongly contends that the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father is taught in the Scriptures, I maintain, nevertheless, that this most certain truth is not demonstrated by him, nor can it be validly demonstrated against the Arians and Socinians if one admits the hermeneutical principles which this man uses to distort and deny the doctrine of the procession of the Spirit also from the Son, which is expressed just as clearly in the Scriptures and, as regards the description of the matter itself, even more clearly.

Since the individual dogmas concerning the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity are intimately connected with each other, it follows that, if one is denied, the others are also undermined. This very thing happens with our Photian. He wished to retain and prove the genuine sense of immanent and eternal procession in the words of Christ, "The Spirit proceeds from the Father." But at the same time, he sought out and gathered from his heretical predecessors arguments to

prove that all passages of Scripture in which, if not the word itself, certainly the very thing and description of procession from the Son is contained, can and should be understood not of the eternal but of the temporal procession of the Holy Spirit, and only of the consubstantiality of the Spirit with the Son.

1° Hence Macarius and the Photians generally cannot use any declaration, however manifest, of the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father as recorded in the sacred writings if the same declaration is equally contained in the Scriptures concerning procession from the Son; but they are forced to interpret as referring to eternal procession only that which is not found written in the same way about procession from the Son. Now indeed, in all the Scriptures there is absolutely nothing of this kind except the word "proceed" materially considered in John 15:26. For all the other texts in which the very reality of immanent procession is declared are evidently shown to be common to the Son with the Father. That the Spirit receives all things from the Father; this is written no less, indeed more directly, of the Son. The Spirit is called the Spirit of the Father; but no differently is He the Spirit of the Son. The Spirit, according to the constant testimony of the Scriptures, is not the first person, but is related as the third to the first person, the Father; but the third person in necessary order is proximately (προσεχώς) related to the second, the Son, and through the Son (διὰ τοῦ προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου) to the Father, because the Son himself, begotten of the Father, is one with the Father. The Father is taught to have His Spirit from eternity, to be sent by Him in time; but in the same way, the Son has His Spirit from eternity, to be sent temporally by Him.

All these testimonies, which contain the clearest demonstration and, as it were, definition of the immanent procession of the Spirit from the Father, Macarius and all Photians are compelled to carefully conceal or pervert, lest the one and same internal relation

of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son be immediately understood. For the demonstration, therefore, of eternal procession from the Father, there remains to them (as we have said) only the word "proceed"; for this alone, if considered materially, is not found equally enunciated in the sacred books about the Son as about the Father, whereas the very thing signified by that word is defined and declared in the same Scriptures no less of the Son than of the Father.

2° For the same heresy preconceived against and contrary to the Scriptures, they are forced to fabricate a double procession of the Holy Spirit, eternal and temporal, so separated that, contrary to the entire revealed economy of the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity, the procession in time is assumed separately, and by no means including the eternal procession. With this absurd separation established as a principle without being able to offer even a semblance of proof,

Macarius with other Photians (2) attempts to distort all the testimonies by which the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son is taught, either to apply only to temporal procession or simultaneously to the consubstantiality of the Spirit with the Son.

3° Now, with these principles established, not even the eternal procession from the Father could be demonstrated any longer from that testimony which the schismatics have left untouched in John 15:26; for the sophistical subterfuges habitually recited by them, if they were valid against the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit

---

2 This principle of separation completely perverts the very concept of divine eternity, the connection of actions ad extra in time with internal and eternal acts, the distinction of persons from relations of origin described in the sacred writings, and contains as it were in germ the Photian heresy. Macarius, however, establishes it with wonderful confidence, as if clear in itself and needing no proof, before all his sophistical arguments. "To clarify ideas in the development of this doctrine, it is necessary to establish a rigorous distinction between the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit, which properly forms His personal attribute, and His temporal procession upon creatures or His mission in the world, which does not relate to the hypostasis itself of the Holy Spirit, but forms something external, accessory, and is not attributed more to the Holy Spirit than to the Son. John 16:28-29." (If these were pressed, the mission of the divine person both of the Holy Spirit and of the Son, and consequently the incarnation of the Word would have to be denied, and the whole Gospel perverted; but of these things the discussion will recur below). "If the Orthodox Church (the Photian schism) affirms that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone... it properly means to speak only of the eternal and hypostatic procession of the Holy Spirit. As for His temporal procession, the Orthodox themselves believe with Western Christians that the Holy Spirit proceeds, that is, holds His mission in the world, not only from the Father, but also from the Son, or to put it better, through the Son" l.c. p. 326.

from the Son, would have no less force against the sense of immanent procession from the Father enunciated in this testimony.

Indeed, from the word itself "the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father," considered in itself, eternal procession is no more determined than temporal procession, if indeed, according to the preconceived principle of the schismatics, there can be a procession of person from person in time without necessarily containing or presupposing eternal procession. Macarius himself saw this, and therefore he attempted to establish a proof that these words of Christ the Lord must necessarily be understood not of temporal but of eternal procession.

But all his proofs he himself subverts by the very things he argues against eternal procession from the Son. There are three arguments of Macarius.

a) From the purpose of the discourse. Christ the Lord taught in this passage the divinity of the Holy Spirit, therefore the procession from the Father should be understood as eternal. But although the antecedent is true, which however is established by far other demonstrations than those produced there by Macarius; from this only the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with the Father is proved (3), but by no means (admitting Photian principles) does eternal procession follow; and therefore by this argument the Photians cannot prove that by these words, "who proceeds from the Father," anything else is said than the temporal mission and procession of the consubstantial Spirit to sanctify, teach, and confirm the Apostles. It should be carefully noted that the question now is not generally

---

[3] This matter is much clearer from the form in which Macarius proposes the argument for the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father. "The Savior finally adds, that this Comforter to come, this Spirit of truth, is not a creature, but that He proceeds from the Father, that is, that He has the eternity of God, and that He is consequently a divine person."

whether there is and whence is the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit; but the question is whether it is demonstrated by these words, "who proceeds from the Father." Certainly if the Photians find in the words of Christ, where the third person is said to receive all things from the sescond, nothing else than the consubstantiality and temporal procession of that third person from the second, much more easily will this same and nothing more be understood in the words, "who proceeds from the Father"; namely, it will be said that He proceeds from the Father into the Apostles.

In truth, the Holy Spirit eternally proceeds as a gift, as the Fathers describe His personal character, with a relation to the external, that is, to procession or mission in time (cf. Th. XXXIII. n. 1.); and therefore in the Scriptures both processions are always interconnected, so that eternal procession is never presented without respect to mission, and the latter always includes or presupposes the former. While, therefore, the Photians absurdly separate procession in time from eternal procession, they cannot prove the latter from the words of Scripture either.

b) Macarius proves eternal procession from the Father from the very form of the words in two ways. First, he says, if the procession from the Father were understood as temporal, this would be the sense: "whom I will send from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who is sent from the Father"; which (he says) presents an absurd tautology. The second argument is drawn from the verb in the present tense "proceeds," although the mission was still future.

But given the schismatics' separation of procession in time from eternal procession, neither argument has any validity. According to Catholic principles and in the genuine sense of the words as explained by the Fathers, the first clause in the words of Christ the Lord, "whom I will send to you from the Father," states explicitly the mission from the Son, but implicitly also the mission from the Father

and at the same time the immanent procession from the Father and the Son; the second clause, "who proceeds from the Father," explicitly teaches the same immanent procession from the Father, which was already comprehended in the prior clause; and certainly no tautology is found in the fact that what was first said implicitly is afterwards enunciated explicitly. If, however, from the hypothesis of the schismatics, in the first clause there were contained explicitly only the mission from the Son in no way including immanent procession, and perhaps implicitly the mission from the Father; certainly it could in no way be considered tautological that in the second clause the mission also from the Father was explicitly stated, and Christ gave the reason why He said not simply that He would send, but that He would send from the Father. The words, therefore: "whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father," would be resolved into this sense: "whom I will send to you from the Father; for not only from me, but equally also from the Father does He proceed and is sent to you."

Furthermore, the grammatical argument from the verb in the present tense is in itself too weak. For, to mention nothing else, it is well known that things about to happen soon are usually expressed in the form of the present tense; "I lay down my life"; "I go to the Father"; "yet a little while, and the world sees me no more"; "if I go away, I come again"; "what you do, do quickly," and many others. Moreover, the Son promises the coming of the Holy Spirit himself with the verb in the future as well as in the present tense: "you are witnesses of these things; and behold, I send (καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω al. κἀγὼ ἀποστέλλω) the promise of my Father upon you" Luke 24:49. If, therefore, Macarius contends that the grammatical form of the present tense "proceeds" must necessarily be understood of eternal and not only of temporal procession still future, for the same reason he will be forced to confess that in the verb of the present tense, when

the Son said "I send," not only the temporal emission then still future, but also the eternal emission from the Son is signified. But since he denies this from his principle, by which he separates mission from procession, now the argument from the present tense in the verb, "proceeds from the Father," will prove nothing at all.

c) Finally, appeal is made to the authority of the Fathers, who understood the passage in John 15:26 as referring to eternal procession. This is indeed most true; but if the Photians sincerely acknowledge tradition and the testimonies of the Fathers, they are bound to confess no less the immanent procession from the Son than from the Father, as has been abundantly and evidently demonstrated both by other Catholics and in our Treatise.

The theology and hermeneutical principles fabricated by Macarius after other Photians to pervert the meaning of the Scriptures concerning the Spirit or the spirated of the Son, hearing and receiving all things from the Son, to be sent and sent by the Son, concerning finally the relation of the third person of the Most Holy Trinity to the second no less than to the first, all tend to undermine also the doctrine of those same Scriptures concerning the procession of the Spirit from the Father, so that it cannot be properly defended against the Arians, Macedonians, and Socinians.

CHAPTER II.
ON THE PROOF OF THE PHOTIAN DOCTRINE FROM SCRIPTURE PRESENTED BY MACARIUS

1° After we have seen how the Photian doctrine undermines the very force of testimonies concerning the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father, and by denying the internal procession from the Son provides weapons to those heretics who, just as the Photians do with the Son, admit only the temporal mission of the

Holy Spirit from the Father; now we descend to the second part of Macarius's interpretations. The Photian position, by which they dissent from Catholics, would need to be found either explicitly or at least implicitly and equivalently contained in the Scriptures—namely, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, such that He does not proceed from the Son, who is one with the Father.

But a) this position nowhere appears explicitly in the entirety of Scripture. What Luther perpetrated in his German translation of the sacred books by interpolating the text of Romans III. 28, "we hold that man is justified by faith alone," so that he might have a testimony not of the Apostle but his own for his preconceived heresy concerning justification by faith alone; this Photius and his followers did not dare to do in the original text. Therefore, the uncorrupted reading of John XV. 26 remains for them: "who proceeds from the Father." Wherefore, until some sacrilegious hand of another Luther comes to their aid, writing "who proceeds from the Father alone," they cannot show their dogma explicitly expressed in Scripture.

b) It would remain, therefore, for them to demonstrate either from the context of John XV. 26 or by comparison with other passages that the affirmation "who proceeds from the Father" has an exclusive sense—namely, that the Spirit is said to proceed from the Father not insofar as the Father is one with the Son in the power and act of spiration, but insofar as in the spiration itself the Father and the Son are distinguished not only from the Spirit proceeding or that which is spirated, but also from each other. From this it would be concluded that the Photian dogma is implicitly contained in Scripture. But of this doctrine, which is completely repugnant to the revealed mystery, there is no trace in sacred literature, so much so that even sophists could not extract any semblance of proof. Hence Macarius himself did not even dare to attempt this proof. What then did he do? He saw his craft reduced to this one thing: to try to

persuade that the passages of Scripture from which Catholics prove the procession of the Spirit from the Son could be taken in another sense, by which they would be understood not concerning the eternal procession but separately concerning the temporal procession or concerning the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with the Son.

2° If we were to grant all this to the man, what would finally follow? It would follow what I said at the beginning: that neither the Photian doctrine of procession from the Father alone, excluding the Son, nor the Catholic dogma of procession from the Father, as the Father is one with the Son in spiration, is contained in the Scriptures themselves; and therefore this is one of those points of doctrine which are not recorded in the Scriptures, but only in apostolic preaching and tradition of the Church and preserved through the course of centuries under infallible teaching authority, and after controversy arose were believed more diligently, preached more insistently, and cultivated more carefully. But in consulting these very documents of tradition, let that gross fraud or folly finally be set aside, by which the Photians heap up statements of the Fathers and Councils attesting to the procession from the Father, about which there is no controversy, and let only those monuments which pertain to the matter be

compared with each other ([4]); I mean monuments affirming procession from the Son, which are very numerous, or denying the same, of which none from otherwise orthodox witnesses can be produced up to Photius, as we have sufficiently demonstrated in our Treatise. But since it is most certain that the revelation concerning the Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son is found recorded in the evangelical and apostolic writings themselves (Theological Tract. XXXII-XXXIV), and now we have proposed to pursue the tortuous tunnels of our Macarius, let us examine the reasons by which he himself tries to deflect the doctrine of the Scriptures to that sense of his—of mission separated from immanent procession, and of consubstan-tiality. There are five testimonies against whose genuine sense the Photian tests his strength.

---

[4] Indeed the Savior said, "who proceeds from the Father"; the same was confessed by the holy Councils, the same by the venerable Fathers; but this slanderer (Photius) asserts that they taught what he thinks the statement indicates, namely "who proceeds from the Father alone"... These two statements do not signify the same thing: "who proceeds from the Father" and "who proceeds from the Father alone"... To the Latins "who proceeds from the Father alone" seems spurious; but to the Greeks "who proceeds from the Father and the Son" seems spurious, because neither is found written in the Gospels. But they are so opposed that one of the two must necessarily be true, and the other not. But that He proceeds from the Son is consonant and concordant with the Scriptures, and nothing contrary or repugnant is found, although it is not explicitly stated in the councils (Constantinople and others reciting its creed). For each of the Roman Pontiffs who sanctified and confirmed the councils always said and taught this. And indeed Athanasius, Basil, Cyril, and the rest of the saints clearly followed this; therefore it is necessary to hold and say "from the Son" - Hugo Etherianus against the Greeks, Book II, ch. 17. Max. Library of the Fathers, Vol. XXII, p. 1232.

§ I.
On the Testimony of Christ in John 15:26

The Catholics teach, he says, that in the words "who proceeds from the Father," the procession from the Son is not excluded but included, because the Father and the Son are one in essence, and the Son has all that the Father has. Against this doctrine, which is presented in a less than sincere form, Macarius argues. This exposition of Catholic doctrine is indeed not sincere, I say; for we state that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son because the Father and the Son, the first and second persons, are one in their spirative power in relation to the third person, not because they are one in essence under the formal aspect of essence. Just as the reason for procession from the Father is not formally the essence as essence, which is common to the three persons, but rather the spirative power in the Father; so too the reason for procession from the Father and the Son is not the unity of essence, but the one spirative power in the Father and the Son, which in the Father is uncommunicated (προκαταρκτικώς) but in the Son is communicated from the Father. Indeed, just as the Photians themselves are compelled to confess that the Father is the principle of the Holy Spirit not under the aspect of the absolute or essence, but under the aspect of the relative, that is, as spirator, so the Father and the Son are one principle of the Spirit not under the aspect of the absolute, as they are one essence, but under the aspect of the relative as one spirator. The reason why the spirative power is one communicated from the Father to the Son is contained in that fundamental principle: in the Trinity all things are one, where there is no opposition of relation. Nevertheless, let Macarius's arguments be presented one by one.

1° Three persons, he says, are one in essence; but the personal attributes (as he himself speaks) are proper to each person, lest with

the Sabellians the divine hypostases be confused. Now when the Father is said to generate the Son and to spirate the Holy Spirit, the discourse concerns the Father as a person, according to his personal attribute, by which he is distinguished from the Son and from the Holy Spirit. Therefore, under the name of the Father, the Son cannot also be comprehended, who is one with the Father in essence but not in personality.

This entire discourse either says nothing or assumes as a principle of demonstration the very thing that is to be demonstrated; but this, just as it is most disgraceful to all other men, so it should not be permitted even to the Photian sophists. He posits two things in the Father, which he calls personal attributes: the generation of the Son and the spiration of the Holy Spirit; then in the singular number, personal attribute is said to distinguish the Father from the Son and the Holy Spirit. If he means by this that the Father is distinguished from the Son by generation as the immanent term of generation, and is distinguished from the spirated, or from the Holy Spirit, by spiration as the immanent term of that spiration, this is indeed most true and is taught by all Catholics; but it has nothing whatsoever to do with the Photian cause. For the only question is whether the Father, by the very formal notion of spiration, by which he is related not to the Son but to the Holy Spirit alone, is distinguished from the Son. Thus understood in this sense, Macarius's entire discourse is completely inept for his proposed goal.

But if he (as it seems) cunningly constructs his argument from this principle, that spiration is proper to the Father alone and not common to the Son, he certainly proves the same thing by the same thing. For it is the same to say that spiration is proper to the Father alone, and not common to the Son (which is assumed without any proof as an antecedent); and to say that the spirated or the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, and not from the Father and

the Son (which Macarius pretends to deduce as a consequence from that identical proposition).

Macarius's own words in the French translation run thus: "When it is said that the Father begets the Son and causes the Holy Spirit to proceed, one speaks properly of the Father as a person having his personal attribute which distinguishes him from the Son and from the Holy Spirit. Consequently also, when it is said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, under the name of the Father one cannot at the same time understand the Son, who is one with the Father in essence, but not in personality" p. 330. What the Russians might understand from this disturbed conglomeration of words, I truly do not know. When it is said, "the Father generates the Son," the Father is stated under the formal aspect of paternity, by which he is constituted as a person distinct from the Son proceeding through that very generation. When it is said, "the Father spirates the Holy Spirit," indeed the person of the Father constituted by the formal aspect of paternity is named in the subject; in the predicate the power and act of spiration is attributed to him, by which he is not related to the Son, and therefore by it he is not distinguished from the Son; but spiration is the fruitful love communicated from the Father to the Son, by which they are one no less than in essence, and as one producing principle they are related to the Holy Spirit or to the produced and subsisting love, and therefore by the same spiration they are really distinguished from him, as from the term of spiration. What is said in the conclusion is ridiculous. Certainly under the name of the Father the Son is never comprehended; for by these names two persons are expressed under that formal aspect by which they are distinguished from each other. But with this real distinction of paternity and filiation presupposed, that which is common and one with another person can be stated of one person. When the Son said: "I and the Father are one," he did not include himself under the name of the

Father, but indeed distinguished himself from the Father; then in the predicate he declared in what respect the two distinct persons are one. So also when it is said, "the Father spirates the Holy Spirit," or "the Spirit proceeds from the Father," or "the Spirit is of the Father," under the name of the Father no person other than the first can be understood; but that which is common and one with the second person is stated of the first, and by this he is distinguished not from the second but from the third person alone. Those who spirate (the principle which) are two persons distinct by paternity and filiation but not by spiration; the formal aspect under which they spirate (the principle by which), is one common fruitful love or one spirative power; just as there are three persons distinct by properties who create, but there is one common act by which they create. Therefore two distinct persons are one spirator, just as three distinct persons are one creator (Augustine, Trinity, Book V, ch. 14). We deny, therefore, that spiration is a personal property in the strict sense (Thesis XXV); for the formal aspect of spiration does not constitute a distinct person, unless perhaps the adversaries wish to introduce four hypostases; nor is it proper to one person only, but it is a relation common to the first and second persons.

This community of spiration against the Photian heresy we certainly do not assume as a principle of proof; but rather the entire Section III of our Treatise on the Trinity is dedicated to proving it from the documents of revelation. Our argumentation from John XV. 26 is by no means as follows: spiration is common to the Father and the Son, therefore while in that place the Holy Spirit is said to proceed from the Father, the Son must also be understood together with the Father; which would be a petitio principii similar to that of which we accuse the schismatics. But rather we first demonstrate the doctrine comprehended in Scripture and tradition, that the Father is not distinguished from the Son by spirative power; and only then do

we infer that in the words of Christ the Lord affirming procession from the Father, the Father is understood as communicating the spirative power to the Son, and therefore as one principle with the Son of the Holy Spirit. For this reason, not in the first place, as Macarius disturbs the order; but in the last place after demonstrating the unity of the Father and the Son in spirating, we infer as a corollary this Thesis: in the words of Christ, "the Spirit of truth proceeds from the Father," the Son is not excluded but included as one principle with the Father of the proceeding Spirit.

But I know not what they mutter about Sabellianism in exactly the same way as the Arians were accustomed to object to the Catholics teaching the unity of the Father and the Son in all things, except in relations to each other, the confusion of persons.

It is the common doctrine of the holy Fathers, often demonstrated by us in the entire Treatise, that there is no distinction in the Trinity except through the relations of origin alone, that is, through the real procession of one person from another. We say, therefore, that the Father and the Son are two persons really distinct from each other by the personal properties alone of paternity (including unbegottenness) and filiation, and that they are one not only in essence and absolute attributes, but no less in spiration, by which they are not referred to each other (for the Son does not proceed by spiration); but by one common relation of spirator they are referred to the Holy Spirit proceeding from them, and therefore by this very spiration and procession really distinct from them as a third person. There is, therefore, no confusion of persons in Catholic doctrine, but a defense of that real distinction which alone according to revealed truth can and must be admitted, while retaining the three personal properties that distinguish and constitute: paternity, filiation, procession.

But the Photians evidently pervert the entire mystery. For first they say that the Father is really distinguished from the Son by spiration, without by the same being related to the Son as the term of spiration; and moreover that the Son is really distinguished from the Holy Spirit, without there being a relation of origin of one from the other. But who does not see that by both of these assertions the principle defended by the Fathers with common consent against the Arians is fundamentally overturned, namely, that there is no distinction among the divine persons except according to the relations of origin or according to the aspect of principle and proceeding from the principle (κατὰ τὸ αἴτιον καὶ τὸ αἰτιατόν). But if, retaining this fundamental principle, they nevertheless deny the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, nothing is left to them but to teach that the Father is related to the Son as the term by spiration itself, i.e., the Son proceeds from the Father by spiration, and thus the Son and the Holy Spirit are not two persons really distinct from each other, but one person proceeding from the Father by origin, which is called at one time generation and at another time spiration, and therefore gives the name of either Son or Holy Spirit to the proceeding person.

2º Macarius is not ashamed to repeat that stupid objection of other Photians. If (they say) because of the unity of essence of the Father and the Son, the Spirit is said to proceed equally from the Son as from the Father; from this it necessarily follows that the Holy Spirit, who is of one essence with the Father, generates the Son together with the Father; indeed since the essence of the three persons is one, the consequence will be that the Son is generated not only by the Father and the Holy Spirit but also by himself; and the Holy Spirit, just as he proceeds from the Father and the Son, so equally

proceeds from himself as well (5). I do not know why they omitted another inference no less worthy of the ingenuity and wisdom of these men; for by the same right they could have added: if the third person proceeds from the first and second, the consequence will be that the first person, the Father, is said to proceed both from himself and from his Son and his Spirit.

Truly these jests of buffoons in the most august mystery of the faith, to be abhorred with the whole mind, do not deserve a response; nevertheless, they demonstrate that through the heresy against the Holy Spirit that they have introduced, the Photians have lost all genuine notions of the processions and of the distinction and unity of the divine persons. Most absurdly it is supposed in the objection that according to Catholic doctrine all relations are said to be common to the divine persons because of the unity of essence, which would be a negation of the relations themselves, and consequently of the distinction of persons in God. The Catholic Church has always taught (as is evident from the documents of the Fathers) and teaches that all things are common to the divine persons except the aspect of principle and proceeding from the principle, and therefore, as Cyril says (see Thesis XXXV. p. 522), namely that the only-begotten Word is all that the Father is, except for paternity alone; therefore spiration which is not formally paternity, or fruitful love through which subsisting love proceeds, is no less common to the Father and the Son than the essence itself and the absolute attributes.

---

5 "One will be forced to admit that the Son begotten by the Father is also begotten by himself, and that the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father also proceeds from himself, and this by reason of their unity of essence with the Father and their co-eternity to all" p. 331. The heresiarch Photius himself in his book on Mystagogia, in the 3rd encyclical letter and 13th to the Bishop of Aquileia has many such sophisms, the more inept they are, the more they are inflated with tumid words.

Moreover, the Church teaches, or rather supposes as self-evident to every rational soul, without which we could not believe, that which is called into question only among the Photians and perhaps in insane asylums, that a person neither is nor can be conceived as the principle of itself or the principle of its principle, from which it itself proceeds. From the fact, therefore, that one person proceeds from another as a distinct principle, the second from the first as the Word from the mind (as the Fathers explain), and, supposing the generation of the Word, the third person from the first and second, as subsisting love and expressed by one common love of the Father and the Son; from this dogma, I say, to infer that the Son from whom the Holy Spirit proceeds as from one principle with the Father, proceeds in turn from the Holy Spirit, or that the Holy Spirit proceeds from himself, is certainly most foolish. For what is the procession of a divine person, if not that it has subsistence and commu-nicated nature from another person? By the very fact, therefore, that the Holy Spirit has nature communicated from the Father and the Son, he does not have it from himself as the Father does, nor communicated from himself, which evidently contradicts, nor does he himself communicate it either to the Father or to the Son.

The co-eternity of the divine persons, about which Macarius murmurs something, removes times, but does not remove the thoroughly established and fixed order of origin of the divine persons

(Thesis XXXIII) ([6]), unless perhaps because of co-eternity Macarius should say that, because the second person is generated by the first, the first is also conversely generated by the second. If he perhaps understands this to be absurd, let him confess that it is equally absurd to conclude from the fact that the third person proceeds from the second, that the second conversely proceeds from the third. If the internal necessary order of origins is perverted, and by this very fact the economy of the Holy Trinity, no less necessary than the divine

---

[6] "Can we therefore ask whether the Holy Spirit had already proceeded from the Father when the Son was born; or had not yet proceeded and when he was born proceeded from both; where there are no times?.... These things cannot at all be asked there, where nothing begins in time, that it might be perfected in the time following; wherefore whoever can understand the generation of the Son from the Father without time, let him understand without time the procession of the Holy Spirit from both. And whoever can understand... that he begat him without time, so that the life which the Father gave to the Son by begetting is co-eternal with the life of the Father who gave it, let him understand that just as the Father has in himself, that from him the Holy Spirit proceeds, so he gave to the Son, that from him the same Holy Spirit proceeds, and both without time: and thus it is said, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, so that it may be understood, that it also proceeds from the Son, is from the Father to the Son (this very thing that the Holy Spirit proceeds also from the Son, the Son has communicated from the Father). For if whatever he has, the Son has from the Father; from the Father he has indeed, that from him also the Holy Spirit proceeds. But let no times be thought of there, which have before and after, because there are absolutely none there... The Father alone is not from another, and therefore alone is called unbegotten... But the Son is born of the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father principally (προκαταρκτικώς), and he giving without any interval of time, proceeds commonly from both... He is not begotten from both, but proceeds from both, the Spirit of both" Augustine, Trinity, Book XV, n. 47.

essence and existence itself, then from absurdities will certainly follow absurdities. Indeed, if you posit that the spiration of the Holy Spirit is prior in the order of origin to the generation of the Word, and thus the Holy Spirit is the second person, the Word the third person; from this will certainly follow what the Photians want, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, and moreover that which Macarius finds not in Catholic doctrine but in the fictions of a disturbed mind, namely that the Son, that is the third person, is generated by the first and the second, the Father and the Holy Spirit.

3º Macarius, as if saying something great, with Mark of Ephesus (whom he himself places in the canon of Saints), asks why Christ, after attributing the mission of the Holy Spirit both to the Father and to himself, immediately after those words speaking of procession, said, "who proceeds from the Father," and not, "who proceeds from us"? (7)

a) We answer that this was done because Eternal Wisdom did not wish to consult men about the words by which it would deliver its doctrine to the Apostles and the Church, men who now ask why it did not say these very words, "who proceeds from me," just as others ask why it did not say: the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are three consubstantial persons (an objection frequent among the Arians); why it did not say: this is eternal life, that they may know

---

7 "This sending (of the Holy Spirit) he attributes either to the Father, or to himself: by saying to them: and I will send him to you (John XV. 26, comp. XIV. 26). But as soon as immediately after these words he begins to speak of the procession of the Holy Spirit, it is no longer anything but the Father that he indicates without making any allusion to his own person. Why then, we will ask with Saint Mark of Ephesus, our divine Savior after having spoken so directly of himself, and attributed to himself as well as to the Father the sending of the Holy Spirit, did he not say equally of the procession who proceeds from us?" pg. 332.

you and me and the Holy Spirit, the only true God (Pneumatomachi in St. Basil against Eunom., Book V, p. 310, 311); why it did not say many other things which the vainest sophists imagine for themselves, until they fall into that blasphemy of affirming that Christ himself by the manner of his preaching introduced variety in doctrine, for unless he himself had wanted this variety, he would have spoken more clearly (Ephemeral Ecclesiastical Darmstadt apud cl. loerg Hist. Protest. T. I. p. 126).

b) It is false that Christ immediately before enunciated the mission of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son together. He declared in one context, John XIV. 26, the mission from the Father, and in another, XV. 26, the mission from the Son. But just as in the mission from the Father the Son is included, and in the mission from the Son the Father is included, because the Father and the Son are one in the power of sending: so no less in the procession from the Father the Son is included; for the Father and the Son are one in the power of sending the third divine person for this very reason, that they are one in the power of spirating, as the holy Fathers teach and Cardinal Bessarion has excellently demonstrated (Thesis XXXIII).

c) Not only in this very place does Christ implicitly include procession from the Son just as from the Father, as was shown in Thesis XXXIV; but also a little later in chapter XVI, by the very description of procession, he explicitly teaches that the third person receives from the second, just as the second person receives all things from the first person (Thesis XXXII). Therefore, just as in distinct places he first taught the mission from the Father, then the mission from the Son; so also he first explicitly enunciated the procession from the Father, not excluding but including the Son, and afterwards explicitly declared the procession from the Son, including the Father.

The reason why the Son, just as he refers his other attributes in other places, so in this place refers the spiration of the Holy Spirit

explicitly to the Father, is declared by St. Augustine in several places, some of which we cited in Thesis XXXIV. But that Macarius dares to cast suspicion of interpolation on the passage of Augustine from Book II, ch. 14, n. 1, against Maximinus, where this same reason is explained, without any foundation (8), is characteristic of an impudent man. "This Spirit of both," says Augustine, "since he proceeds from both. But therefore when the Son spoke of him, he says, 'proceeds from the Father,' because the Father is the author of his procession (the primordial principle without principle), who generated such a Son, and by generating gave to him, that the Holy Spirit should proceed from him also. For unless he proceeded from him also, he would not say to the disciples, 'Receive the Holy Spirit,' and giving it by breathing on them, signifying that it proceeds from him also, he openly showed by breathing what he gave occultly by

---

8 The reasons he brings to prove interpolation from the context of the discourse are certainly laughable, if one has even a passing acquaintance with the doctrine of Augustine. For the holy Doctor, just as in this place so elsewhere frequently (e.g., Trinity, Book XV, n. 47; in John, tract 99, n. 9), in the question of why the Holy Spirit is not said to be begotten as the Son, is accustomed to give this reason, because he does not proceed from the Father alone, but from the Father and the Son together (as subsisting holiness or charity from both). Thus also Epiphanius teaches that the Spirit is not called the Son, because he does not proceed from the Father alone but from the Father and the Son; Ancorat n. 71; Haeres 74, n. 8. Paschasius the Deacon says, "if you ask what distinguishes between the one who is born and the one who proceeds, this is evidently the difference, that the former is born from one, the latter proceeds from both" On the Holy Spirit, Book 1, ch. 12. cf. Isidore, Etymol., VII, ch. 3, n. 8. Macarius not understanding these confidently exclaims: "is this not evidently an interpolation?" And indeed the man seems not to have read the holy Fathers and especially Augustine elsewhere, than in citations gathered here and there in the books of schismatic theologians like Zoernikau and similar ones.

spirating. Because therefore if he were born, not only from the Father, nor only from the Son, but from both surely, he would without doubt be called the Son of both. And because of this, because he is in no way the Son of both, it was not fitting that he be born of both" Augustine, loc. cit. And indeed not only that single passage; but the entire doctrine of Augustine on the Trinity, and his very many and extended disputations on the procession and the mode of procession from the Father and the Son would have to be cut out by the Grecians, if they wanted to eliminate the profession of this dogma from the works of the holy doctor. That Macarius then makes little of the authority of Augustine, where he refutes the Photian heresy already before its emergence, is not surprising; but it is certainly surprising that he dares to say that Augustine alone opposes the entire Church in the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son (9), when the unanimous consensus of the holy Fathers and of the whole Church guarded by the Holy Spirit in the revealed dogma is evidently demonstrated, against which Photius first concocted heresy to defend his ambition and his schism.

§ II.
On Procession as the Root of Mission

Macarius disputes against the argument by which Catholic theologians, along with the Holy Fathers, demonstrate the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son through the power of sending and the

9 "Let us even suppose the integrity of this passage of Augustine (they kindly suppose that, of which no mortal can doubt; and they know only one testimony, where there are very many), what does the assertion of a single Doctor signify before that of the entire Church?" (i.e., the testimony of all the holy Doctors and of the whole Church is worth nothing against a synagogue torn apart by schism, rotting with heresy).

mission of the third divine person, which power and mission is common to both Father and Son (Thesis XXXIII). He deduces his arguments from an incomplete and distorted notion of mission, and hence from inappropriately applied testimonies of Scripture and the Fathers.

1° Regarding mission itself, our adversary considers only the action in creatures or ad extra, and completely suppresses the very foundation in the mission of divine persons and the essential element, whenever the mission is not viewed in the incarnate Word according to his humanity, but in the person according to divine nature. This foundation is nothing other than the relation of origin of the person sent to the sender, as has been sufficiently demonstrated in Thesis XXXIII. Therefore, the Holy Fathers urged the mission of one person by another against the Sabellians as an irrefutable argument of distinction, not merely between different manifestations ad extra, which those heretics freely conceded—indeed, in which they themselves constituted three persons (τρία πρόσωπα) of one hypostasis, that is, three different appearances—but the Fathers asserted that from the mission itself a real distinction is demonstrated between one who sends and another who is sent; for, as Basil says in the aforementioned passage against Eunomius (p. 297), the Spirit does not send himself. Moreover, such a real distinction between divine persons has never been acknowledged by the Fathers as anything other than from the relations of origin of the sent from the sender.

Furthermore, in this very fact that mission comprehends the relation of origin of the person sent to another by whom he is sent, lies the sole reason, as Augustine often teaches, why the Father is never said to be sent, while the begotten Son is sent by the begetter, and the Holy Spirit is said in Scripture to be sent by both.

But our adversary has discovered a new reason, which I think will not persuade even his own followers, why the Father is never said to be sent; namely because, according to Macarius, no particular action in the world is attributed to the Father ([10]). Many absurdities can be said by a man fighting against the truth; but these, I confess, have exceeded all my expectations. The contrary proposition is entirely true; precisely because every divine operation is principally, as Augustine says, or as the primordial principle (αἰτία προκαταρκτική) or prototype light (φωτί πρωτοτύπω) ([11]), as the Greek Fathers explain, attributed to the Father, and is in the Father not communicated from another principle: this is the reason why the Father is never said nor can be said to be sent by another person in Scripture and by the Fathers; but he himself through the communication of essence with respect to what is external is most truly taught to send both the Word and, as one principle with the Son, the third person, the Holy Spirit. Hence also in theophanies, where sometimes the Father, sometimes the Son, sometimes the Holy Spirit appeared, we have heard from Augustine (Theses VI and XLII) that the Son is indeed said to be sent by the Father, the Holy Spirit by the Father and the Son because of the commendation of principle; but the Father, although he appeared through a subject creature, is

---

[10] "But since Holy Scripture does not attribute any particular action in the world to the Father, it is not surprising that it does not represent the Father as sent by the Son and the Holy Spirit" p. 334.

[11] "When we have reached an understanding of the unbegotten light, from there again we conceive of the light from it according to proximity, like a ray co-existing with the sun.... and again another such light, in the same way, not cut off from the begotten light by any temporal interval, but shining through it, having the cause of its subsistence from the prototype light" Gregory of Nyssa against Eunomius, Book I. (Migne Vol. XLV. p. 416)

neither said nor can be considered except most absurdly to be sent, since he alone does not have an author.

Note: "My Father works until now, and I work.... the Son can do nothing of himself, unless he sees the Father doing it, for whatever he does, these things the Son also does in like manner. For the Father... shows him all things that he himself does..... just as the Father raises the dead and gives life, so also the Son gives life to whom he will..... The works themselves which I do bear witness of me, that the Father has sent me, and the Father who sent me has borne witness of me" John V, 17ff. "The Father abiding in me, he does the works" ibid. XIV, 10. These and similar passages everywhere evident, our Photian opponent will be forced to deny; for no particular operation in the world is attributed to the Father; but indeed the works in question, the raising of the dead, the Father's testimony of the Son, are particular operations, and all of these are principally attributed to the Father by the Son himself. Or indeed in Russia it will have to be said that all these operations communicated by the Father to the Son, just as they demonstrate the latter's mission from the former, so do they no less demonstrate that the Father is sent by the Son, from which most wise doctrine it will then spontaneously follow that the proposition so often repeated by Christ the Lord, "The Father sent me," is synonymous with this other hitherto unheard of: "I sent the Father." The same applies to other passages where by a particular action in the world the Father and Son are manifested, e.g., in the transfiguration, or the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, e.g., in the baptism of Christ the Lord, or where a particular action of division of graces is attributed to the Spirit, of ministrations to the Son, of operations (ἐνεργημάτων) to the Father 1 Cor. XII, 4-6. cf. Eph. IV, 4-6. Indeed, in his very terms Macarius contradicts himself: for active mission itself in his view is nothing other than operation ad extra. Therefore, whenever the Father is said to send the Son or the Holy

Spirit, a particular action in the world is attributed to the Father himself. Hence, since in his opinion any person, because of an operation attributed to it ad extra, can be said to be sent by any other person, without any regard to origin, the Father, by the very fact that he sends the Son and the Holy Spirit, will also have to be said to be sent by them, which invention is most worthy of Photian theology.

2° But Macarius asserts that the opinion of Catholic theologians, which states that the mission of a divine person includes the origin of the sent from the sender, contradicts Scripture and the doctrine of the Holy Fathers.

From Scripture he offers the testimony of Isaiah XLVIII, 16; LXI, 1; Luke IV, 18, in which passages he says that the Son is said to be sent by the Holy Spirit, who certainly is not the principle of the Son. Our Photian opponent seems to have heard something, at least vaguely, about the explanation of the genuine sense; but he does not present it at all sincerely. He argues thus: Catholics object that the Son was sent by the Holy Spirit by reason of his humanity, as the redeemer of the world, not with regard to his divinity. But first of all, the Father himself sent the Son into the world not with regard to his divinity, but as made of woman (Gal. IV, 4), as the redeemer of men. According to his divinity, being one with the Father, he fills all things, nor can he be sent or move from place to place. Moreover, the Holy Spirit was not sent into the world by the Father and the Son with regard to his divinity, by which he is always everywhere one with them. But the mission of the Holy Spirit into the world by the Father and Son must, with the ancient Doctors, be understood solely of the sensible forms under which he (the Spirit) descended upon the Apostles, and then of the gifts in the souls of the faithful, and generally of the manifestation of his gracious and miraculous power in some place, although by virtue of his divinity he was there at all times p. 333, note 2.

It must be admitted that a greater confusion of all notions could scarcely have been compressed into a few words than has been done here by Macarius. When the mission of a divine person is discussed, a distinction must first be made regarding a person who has two natures proper to himself, divine and human, God-man, the incarnate Word; and that person must therefore be considered in a double state, of human nature either to be assumed or already assumed; then there must be a distinction regarding a person whose nature is only divine, the Holy Spirit. To the incarnate Word, given the incarnation, just as there are two natures, so predicates of a double order apply, divine and human: he is adored as true God; as true man he adores the one and triune God; he reigns with divine power; in human subjection he became obedient unto death to the one and triune God; to him as God sacrifice is offered; he as man offers and is offered, priest and victim (on the Incarnation, Thesis L). Thus, therefore, being sent also belongs to him in different ways. As God, insofar as he is a distinct person proceeding from the Father alone (μόνος μονογενώς), he is sent by the Father alone; not according to the authority of command, but as befits God (θεοπρεπώς), according to the dignity of paternity, because he is eternally generated by the Father, to be sent in time to assume human nature. As man in the assumed nature, he is sent by the authority of the one and triune God for the works of redemption; that is, he is sent by the Father and the Holy Spirit in the proper signification (by reason of the distinction of persons), and in the less strict signification of mission (which in its proper sense includes the distinction of sender and sent) he as God sends himself as man (by reason of the distinction not of persons but of natures).

Augustine explains admirably this twofold different reason for the mission of the Son, because the Word was made flesh, and the other that the Word might be made flesh. First, insofar as Christ is

viewed as man, the holy doctor concedes not by reason of pre-existing nature, which the Arians contended, but by reason of the assumed humanity, that the lesser was sent by the greater, namely man by God. "When therefore the fullness of time came, God sent his Son made of a woman, made under the law, so small indeed, as being made; therefore sent in that he was made. If therefore the greater sends the lesser (as the Arians objected), we too confess him made lesser, but lesser insofar as made, and made insofar as sent."

To these he immediately adds the other mission of the Son from the Father alone according to the divine nature: "But if the Son is said to be sent by the Father in this respect, because the one is Father and the other Son, it in no way prevents us from believing that the Son is equal to the Father and consubstantial and co-eternal, and yet the Son is sent by the Father. Not because the one is greater and the other lesser; but because the one is Father, the other Son; the one begetter, the other begotten; the one from whom he is who is sent, the other who is from him who sends. For the Son is from the Father, not the Father from the Son. According to this it can now be understood that the Son is said to be sent not only because the Word was made flesh, but also sent that the Word might be made flesh... that is, not only is the man understood to be sent because the Word was made, but also the Word is sent that it might become man; because he was sent not according to unequal power or substance or anything in which he is not equal to the Father; but according to this that the Son is from the Father, not the Father from the Son... What wonder then if he is sent, not because he is unequal to the Father, but because he is 'a certain pure emanation of the glory of the almighty God' (Wisdom VII, 25)?... Therefore he is sent by him from whom he emanates (the hypostatic Wisdom). But he is sent in one way that he might be with men, and in another way he was sent that he himself might be man. For he transfers himself into holy souls, and makes

friends of God and prophets, as he also fills holy angels, and through them performs all things suitable for such ministries. But when the fullness of time came, (the same Wisdom) was sent, not to fill angels, nor to be an angel, except insofar as he announced the counsel of the Father, which (counsel) was also his own; nor to be with men or in men, for this he had done before in the fathers and prophets; but that the Word itself might be made flesh, that is, might become man... Therefore the Word of God is sent by him whose Word he is; he is sent by him from whom he was born; he who begot sends, he who was begotten is sent." He then teaches the same connection between procession and mission of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. Augustine, On the Trinity, Book IV, n. 26-29.

With this most lucid doctrine in place, it is now evident that those two or three testimonies in which the Son is said to be sent by the Holy Spirit cannot be understood in any other way except, given the incarnation, of Christ insofar as he is man; or as Augustine says, of the man sent because the Word was made, not of the Word sent that it might become man. And indeed the text and context of the Scriptures clearly demonstrate this.

In the first passage, Isaiah XLVIII, 16, "The Lord sent me and his Spirit," (12) in the literal sense the words are those of Cyrus liberating the people of Israel from exile, as Cyril of Alexandria (in Is. Book IV, Or. 3, on this passage) and others thought. "Since by me, the true God, these things (which preceded concerning liberation

12 It is worthy of note that Didymus, with St. Jerome by no means disapproving as interpreter, read the passage of Isaiah quite differently. "Not only the Son," he says, "but also the Father sends the Holy Spirit," and he confirms this from the words of Isaiah, which he also assumes to be spoken in the person of the Son: "Dominus misit me et Spiritum suum; siquidem non solum Filium, sed Spiritum mittit Deus (Pater)" Didymus on the Holy Spirit. n. 26. [P.L. 39, col.1057]

through Cyrus) were revealed to you before they happened, hear Cyrus saying: The Lord sent me and his Spirit," says Cyril in the cited passage. Or much more probably the words are those of the prophet about himself, who says that he was sent to prophesy to the people by the Lord and by his Spirit, as, among others, Jerome and Theodoret explained in this passage, and among more recent authors, Cornelius a Lapide and others. We freely concede, however, what also Jerome, Theodoret, and many other Fathers indicate, that Isaiah or Cyrus was a type of the Messiah the redeemer. But certainly the mission of Isaiah to prophesy, or of Cyrus to liberate the people, was not a type of the mission of the Word that he might become man, or of the flesh to be assumed; but given the assumption of flesh, it was a type of the Messiah to be sent by the Lord and his Spirit to preach salvation and universally for the works of redemption. "According to Symmachus (the author of one of the Greek versions)," says Jerome in the cited passage, "it is referred to the person of the Lord. According to the frailty of the assumed flesh I say that the Lord sent me and his Spirit."

The second passage from Isaiah 61:1; Luke 4:18 should be understood not only in a typical sense (although St. Thomas and others seem to have understood it this way in this passage) (13), but entirely in the literal sense as referring to Christ. However, this has no bearing on the matter under discussion. For a) the Photians, in order

---

13 Also the Targumist Jonathan, which is certainly not surprising in a Jew, refers the passage to the prophet himself; but Christian interpreters who admit this, because of the citation in Luke 4:18 made by Christ himself, must necessarily add another typical sense beyond this supposed literal sense. Jonathan paraphrases: "The prophet said: the spirit from the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord has inaugurated me to announce to the meek, he has sent me to comfort the broken-hearted."

רוּחַ אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה עָלַי יַעַן מָשַׁח יְהוָה אֹתִי לְבַשֵּׂר עֲנָוִים שְׁלָחַנִי

to make their argument, would need to understand this as referring to the Word itself in its divine nature sent to assume human nature. But if it could be understood this way, then it would no longer be the Holy Spirit but God the Father alone who would be called the sender. For there is a distinction of three persons, who are: the Lord whose Spirit it is, the Messiah who is sent (the Son), and the Spirit of the Lord. Of these three, the sending person in the Hebrew text, in the Latin Vulgate version, and in the Syriac version (cf. Acts 10:38) is expressly called the Lord, who was previously distinguished from the Spirit: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me, he has sent me to announce good news to the meek." (14) According to the Septuagint, which St. Luke quotes, in the second clause the name of the Lord is indeed omitted, but can very easily be understood from the original text. But b) it is evident from every angle, both according to the prophet and in the application made by the Savior himself in Luke, that Christ is said to be both anointed and sent according to his humanity. For in the assumed nature, Christ is anointed by the Holy Spirit both by substantial unction through the union of human nature with the Word, and by accidental unction through the diffusion of all gifts in human nature

[14] If it were permissible to understand "sent" here as referring to the Word itself according to divine nature, the relation of the Spirit to the Word expressed should be understood in that particle "Spirit upon me" or "in me," and consequently the statement would be reduced to what Dionysius of Alexandria and Athanasius say: "The Holy Spirit is always in the hands of the Father who sends and of the Son who carries" (see cited in Thesis XXXV); and thus we would have to consider the procession itself from the Father and the Son as indicated.

itself, ([15]) which are described by Isaiah in another place, Isaiah 11:2-3 (cf. on the Incarnation, Thesis XLI). Therefore, in the same assumed nature, Christ the man is said to be sent to announce good news to the meek. "He rightly said 'upon me,' because he was speaking as the Son of Man; for as the Son of Man he was both anointed and sent to preach the gospel," St. Ambrose, On the Holy Spirit, Book III, ch. 1, n. 2. This mission of Christ for the work of redemption is demonstrated, both from this passage and from elsewhere, to belong no less to the Holy Spirit than to the Father; for it is not by reason of the procession of one person from another, but by reason of the inferior human nature. Thus also at the beginning of the same chapter in Luke we read: "Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the desert," Luke 4:1; and "Jesus went forth in the power of the Spirit into Galilee," ibid. 14; and "in the Spirit of God he cast out demons," Matthew 12:28; and "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power," Acts 10:38. "These statements," says Didymus, explaining the same passages of Scripture, "we ought to understand in a pious sense concerning the Lord in his humanity, who is the whole Christ, one Jesus, the Son of God, not as if he were one and another (as the Gnostics and later the Nestorians claimed); but as if the discussion were about one and the same person as if about another, according to the nature of God and man," Didymus, On the Holy Spirit, n. 43.

---

[15] "For the mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, is not without the grace of the Holy Spirit. For he himself says that the prophetic statement was fulfilled concerning him: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, therefore he has anointed me, he has sent me to evangelize the poor.' For what the only-begotten is, equal to the Father, is not of grace but of nature; but that man was assumed into the unity of person of the only-begotten is of grace, not of nature," Augustine, Tractate on John 74, n. 3.

There are, therefore, two different rationales for the mission of the Son according to his different natures, the first of which, according to the divine nature, cannot be conceived except in view of the origin of the Son from the Father with connotation of the nature to be assumed or, more generally, of the external term, and therefore the Son is not and never has been read as sent in this way except by the Father alone; for this mission is not by the authority of a greater over a lesser, but is an irradiation (ἔμφασις ὡς ἐν κατόπτρῳ, as Basil says on the Holy Spirit, n. 20) of the divine counsel for incarnation and redemption from the Father to the Son through eternal generation itself. The other mission, as presented in the Scriptures, refers to Christ the Lord after the incarnation has taken place, and is carried out by the authority of divine majesty and will over the assumed human nature, according to which the Son truly became obedient. Among some Fathers, moreover, the mission of the Son is said to be by reason of human nature, insofar as this is united to the Son by one common operation of the Trinity, so that the Word is truly man. In both these ways, Christ the man is sent by one divine will and one operation of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and thus is properly sent by the Father and the Holy Spirit, persons distinct from himself, and in some sense the man is sent by himself as God, since (as we have said) this mission is not founded on the order of origin of the persons, but on the diversity of nature, the divine governing and the human subject.

Now the Holy Spirit has only one nature, namely the divine. By this very fact, he can neither be understood nor said to be sent except in the first way, which is reduced to the procession of the one sent from the sender; nor does mission add anything to this eternal relation except the connotation of the external term, namely of supernatural efficiency in time and in the creature. Although this efficiency is common to the three persons, nevertheless related to the

Father and the Son who send the Holy Spirit, it manifests communicable virtue or essence; related to the Spirit who is sent by them, it manifests the same virtue or essence communicated by them. In other words, we say the same thing: the mission of a person considered according to divine nature does not designate in the Holy Trinity a division of operations ad extra, but the order of persons ad intra.

That excellent defender of the Catholic faith and expounder of Augustinian doctrine, St. Fulgentius of Ruspe ([16]), admirably declared this distinction between the mission either of the Son according to divinity or of the Holy Spirit, and the other mission of Christ as man. "The Son is sent by the Father, not the Father by the Son, because the Son is born of the Father, not the Father of the Son. Similarly, the Holy Spirit is also read as sent by the Father and the Son, because he proceeds from the Father and the Son. But because mission is not spoken of in one way in the Holy Scriptures, therefore in the sacrament of the incarnation the Son was sent not only by the Father but also by the Holy Spirit, because the mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, was formed by the operation of the whole Trinity. In another way, however, the Holy Spirit, who naturally proceeds from the Father and the Son, is sent by the Father and the Son. For the Holy Spirit is sent by the Father and the Son when the effect of spiritual grace is given by the Trinity itself, the one

[16] St. Fulgentius, whom the ancients proclaim a singular master and doctor of the Catholic Church (Life of Fulgentius written by a disciple, n. 61), is described to us by Macarian erudition as having been the Bishop of Ruspina (sic) among "obscure writers" (écrivains peu connus) of the 6th century. And what is no less astonishing, he knows only one testimony of Fulgentius (from the book On Faith to Peter, ch. 11), which is thought to prove (censé prouver) procession from the Father and the Son. Macarius, p. 411, 412. See our Thesis XXXV, n. II.

God. But the Son was sent by the Father and the Holy Spirit in another way, when, emptying himself, he took the form of a servant. For to take flesh into his own person and for the Word to become man is not the same as to confer by invisible power the bounty of some gift. For the Holy Spirit did not truly become a dove, or truly become fire, when it was fitting for him to be signified by the vision of such things. But the Word was made flesh, when the only-begotten God took flesh. Yet he did this not by an alien power but by his own, and not by his alone, because that sacrament of piety was accomplished by the one will and power of the whole Trinity," Fulgentius, Against Fabian, fragment 29.

Gregory the Great also explains both rationales, commenting on the words: "As the Father has sent me, I also send you." "The Father sent the Son, whom he decreed to be incarnate for the redemption of the human race... Therefore, just as the Son is loved by the Father, and yet is sent to his passion; so also the disciples are loved by the Lord, and yet are sent to suffering in the world... Although 'being sent' can also be understood according to the nature of divinity. For the Son is said to be sent by the Father by the very fact that he is generated by the Father. For the Son declares that he also sends the Holy Spirit (John 15:26), who, although he is co-equal with the Father and the Son, was nevertheless not incarnate... For if 'being sent' should be understood only as being incarnate, the Holy Spirit would certainly never be said to be sent, who was in no way incarnate. But his mission is his very procession, by which he proceeds from the Father and the Son. Therefore, just as the Spirit is said to be sent because he proceeds, so also the Son is not inappropriately said to be sent because he is generated," Gregory the Great, Homilies on the Gospels, 26, n. 2.

Now let judgment be made concerning the Macarian confusion, which I described at the beginning of this discussion.

Neither the Son, he says, nor the Holy Spirit can be sent according to divinity, because they cannot move from place to place.

a) This fabrication rightly leads to the heresy of the Arians, who, having established this same crude notion of mission, denied the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit from the very mission itself, because it includes a transition from place to place. For since it is taught evidently in the Scriptures and in tradition that the Son, not only after having already assumed humanity, which is circumscribed by place and time, but while existing in only one nature, was sent by the Father to assume humanity; and likewise that the third person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, whose nature is only one, is sent by the Father and the Son; it necessarily follows, if mission includes circumscription and transition to a place where the one sent was not before, that both the Son in his pre-existing nature and the Holy Spirit are circumscribed by place, and therefore are not of divine nature. This argumentation of the Arians, commonly found among the holy Fathers, is rightly solved by no other response than by denying that Arian and Macarian notion of mission, which is inept and unworthy of God.

b) Moreover, this Photian doctrine, which says that the mission of the Holy Spirit is to be understood solely of the gifts and efficiencies ad extra, and not of the divine person itself, if seriously pressed, leads to the denial of the person of the Holy Spirit. For indeed Christ the Lord, in those places where he purposely and more expressly speaks of the third distinct person of the Trinity, speaks of the mission of the Holy Spirit. "I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete, the Spirit of truth... he will remain with you, and will be in you. The Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things. When the Paraclete comes, whom I will send you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father. If I do not go away, the Paraclete will not

come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you," John 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7. Now if, according to the Photian opinion, the mission of the Holy Spirit is understood solely of the gifts and efficiencies ad extra, and not of the person itself, Christ, by promising the mission of the Paraclete and "another Paraclete," and of the Spirit proceeding from the Father, would promise nothing other than gifts and efficiencies ad extra, and other gifts, and gifts that would be said to proceed from the Father. But such created gifts are not proper to one person, but are given by one operation of the divine persons. Therefore, the promise of the Holy Spirit to be sent in all these places will absurdly be reduced to a promise of created gifts, which are imparted to the faithful by the Father and the Son, and the Holy Spirit himself who is sent will be a created gift of the Father and the Son.

c) Hence this opinion that a person considered according to divine nature cannot be sent contains a manifest error against the explicit doctrine of Scripture; for it is the same to say that the Holy Spirit is not sent according to divine nature as to simply deny the mission of the person of the Holy Spirit. For indeed, a person whose nature is only divine, if considered according to this nature is not sent, is in no way sent. In fact, Macarius affirms that mission in the Scriptures is said only of sensible forms, e.g., fire, of created gifts in the souls of the faithful, and of manifestations of divine omnipotence. But all these things are not the divine person sent, but only effects not of one but of three persons, and signs of the person sent. Therefore, he clearly denies against the Scriptures the mission of the divine person itself, and absurdly affirms signs of mission without mission of the person. The contradiction is so manifest that Macarius himself, while denying the mission of the person of the Holy Spirit, was compelled to affirm it at the same time. The mission, he says, of the Holy Spirit should be understood only of sensible forms, under which he (the

Spirit) descended upon the Apostles, and then of gifts, and of the manifestation of admirable power ([17]). Here it is denied that the mission refers to the person of the Holy Spirit itself, if indeed it should be understood solely of sensible forms and gifts, but at the same time it is affirmed that the Holy Spirit himself, who is certainly a divine person, descended upon the Apostles, and therefore according to Christ's promise was sent to the Apostles. Therefore, in so many words with one breath, the same thing is both denied and affirmed.

In summary, since the Photians consider the mission of a divine person not in the person itself, but only in the effects ad extra, which are not the whole rationale of mission, but are something in the term to which the person is sent, or by which the mission of the person is manifested, they disturb and pervert the revealed doctrine itself of the unity and distinction of divine persons. But whoever would consider mission only in the relation of the person sent to the sender, would not sufficiently explain either the supernatural effects and elevation of the creature, or the full notion of mission, or therefore the ways of speaking of Scripture about mission in time and in a creature circumscribed by place. Therefore, it is necessary both to keep in view the eternal relation of origin of the person sent to the sender, or what amounts to the same thing, the eternal communication of essence, counsel, will, operation from the sender to the person sent, and at the same time to consider the manifestation of the person sent as proceeding from another through supernatural effects, either visible or invisible, in the creature, which, although common to the whole Trinity, nevertheless exhibit one person who is said to send as the principle, and the other who is sent by the same as

---

[17] "The sending of the Holy Spirit into the world by the Father and the Son should be understood solely, as the ancient Doctors of the Church did (!!), first of the sensible forms under which he descended upon the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, then of the outpouring of his gifts," p. 334.

proceeding from it. For by these two things, the eternal relation of origin ad intra and the temporal efficiency ad extra manifesting it, the true and complete notion of the mission of a person considered according to divine nature is constituted and completed. See our Theses XXXIII, n. II and XL.

3° It remains for us to speak concerning the Fathers to whom Macarius appeals in order to support his fabricated notion concerning the mission of the divine persons.

a) He introduces Chrysostom, who is said to have declared that the Holy Spirit is not sent according to divinity, but only the gifts of the Holy Spirit ([18]). But first of all, that homily on the Holy Spirit (T. III. p. 797. among the spurious works), from which this saying is taken, is not by Chrysostom but by an unknown author. Furthermore,

---

[18] "If you hear someone saying, 'I will send you the Holy Spirit,' do not understand this according to divinity; for God is not sent. These are names signifying operation (ἐνέργεια)... Certainly whoever sends, sends to other places, in which (the sender himself) is not... But if God is everywhere, to where therefore does he send, who is everywhere?... To what purpose therefore does God send? Or perhaps he himself is indeed everywhere, but he who is sent is not everywhere?... Again if he who sent (the Son) remained above, and he who was sent below, how was he saying: 'and he who sent me is with me'?... Therefore when he says, 'I send you the Holy Spirit'; this is the gift of the Spirit. And that you may learn that the gift is sent, the Savior says to the Apostles, 'remain in Jerusalem, until you are clothed with power from on high'... One thing is the power which is granted, and another is the Spirit who grants... Therefore you cannot show the Holy Spirit sent by pure deity (πεμπόμενον τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὑπὸ γυμνῆς τῆς θεότητος, i.e. by the Father and Son, whom these Semi-Arian heretics confessed as God while denying the divinity of the Holy Spirit). There nn. 10-11. To these are immediately added those things which I have cited (in the Treatise, 2nd ed. p. 476, note) concerning the mission of the Son according to the flesh, attributed to the Father and Holy Spirit.

not a few things are read therein concerning the Holy Spirit which, if not actually false, are certainly not fully stated, and which ought to be corrected or supplemented from those great heralds of the Holy Spirit: Athanasius (in his letters to Serapion), Basil (Book V against Eunomius, and the book on the Holy Spirit), and Cyril (in the Thesaurus and in his commentary on the Gospel of John). Finally, in order that the meaning in those words of the homily might be reconciled with the Fathers and with Scripture itself, it must be established that the author did not have in mind a complete consideration of the mission of the divine persons, but merely a refutation of the Arian heresy; and therefore he assumed that crude notion of mission introduced by the Arians, such as exists among humans, containing a transition to a place where the one sent was not previously present, and indeed even separation of the one sent from the one sending. But limitations and imperfections of this kind can be affirmed only concerning external effects and created gifts, not concerning the divine person itself; and therefore, presupposing such a mission proper to creatures and demonstrating that the one sent is lesser than the one sending, it was certainly right to deny that the Holy Spirit was sent in this Arian sense.

Moreover, this response of that author could perhaps have sufficed to solve the objection of the heretics against the divinity of the Holy Spirit taken from the mission of the same Spirit, by arguing ad hominem; but certainly by conceding or permitting to the heretics a false concept of mission, it was not sufficient for explaining those things which are taught in the Scriptures and by the holy Fathers concerning the mission of the Spirit Paraclete himself. For the Fathers responding to the Arians consider a twofold essential element in the mission of a divine person, as Augustine does most frequently. Those things which occur there proper to created things, and which were pressed by the Arians, they say must be understood concerning

external effects only; but in the very person who is sent, not inequality but procession is signified. But that pseudonymous author, dwelling only on the former created element which was opposed by the Arians against the divinity of the person sent, most truly indeed responded that this was not a property of the person itself, but of external effects; and therefore he denied the mission of the divine person itself not simply, but in this Arian sense. But the Photian, against the manifest doctrine of the Scriptures and Fathers, is forced to deny simply the mission of the person itself understood in the Catholic sense, in order to defend sophistically his heretical denial of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son who sends.

b) If we listen to Macarius, according to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, the Son sends the Holy Spirit, and conversely is sent by the Holy Spirit properly through unity of essence and through participation or cooperation of one with the other in their acts ([19]). I omit this saying unworthy of a theologian concerning participation in the acts of one person with another. No participation can be conceived there where, just as there is absolute unity of essence, so there is absolute unity of all operation; participation in divine perfections is found in creatures derived from God as exemplar and efficient cause. Furthermore, what is said: "The Son sends the Holy Spirit through unity of essence," either has no meaning or, though rather awkwardly expressed, nevertheless has an entirely Catholic sense against the very Photian heresy, for whose defense Macarius introduces these things. For first the personal distinction between the Son sending and the Spirit sent by him is declared; then indeed (if mission through unity of essence signifies anything) the principle by

[19] "The most famous Doctors of the ancient Church tell us, that the Son sends the Holy Spirit, and that he is himself sent by Him, properly through their unity of essence, as through their participation or their cooperation in the acts of one another" (p. 334).

which the Son sends the Spirit is declared, namely through unity, that is, through communication of one essence and operation. But procession from the Son is nothing other than this very eternal communication of essence from the Son into the Holy Spirit. Therefore the mission of a divine person regarded according to divinity undoubtedly presupposes unity of essence in the one sending and the one sent; but unity of essence which exists between the principle and the one proceeding from the principle; and therefore mission is not through unity of essence considered absolutely and in itself, but through communication of essence from the one sending into the one sent. Otherwise the Father could be said to be sent by the Son and by the Holy Spirit, which is most absurd, as is evident in itself to Christians, as we have heard from Augustine. Whence the absurdity of the other opinion is evident, by which it is said that the Holy Spirit sends the Son through unity of essence. He will never find this fiction among any Father or Catholic doctor. Indeed, they teach that the reason why the incarnate Son according to humanity, or formally as man, is also said to be sent by the Holy Spirit, is the subjection of human nature under divine nature, which in the Holy Spirit is one with the Father and Son; and therefore the Spirit does not send the Son through unity of essence, but the Spirit, being one in essence with the Father and Son, sends the Son as man on account of the diversity of the assumed essence or nature. Nevertheless, let us see what most celebrated doctors of the ancient Church the Photian brings forward to fortify his assertion.

α) He cites these words from Ambrose, Book III, chapter 1, on the Holy Spirit: "The Father sent the Son and the Spirit; the Spirit also both the Father sent and the Son. If therefore the Son and Spirit send each other mutually, just as the Father sends, this is not the injury of subjection, but community of power." In this sentence of Ambrose torn from its context, the only question is how the Spirit is

said to have sent the Son, whether by reason of the lower human nature in the incarnate Son, as we affirm the Fathers taught; or indeed through unity of divine essence, as Macarius asserts. But Ambrose in this very place expressly and most carefully shows against the Arians that the Son was sent by the Holy Spirit only according to his lower human nature as by a superior. "Now we add," he says, "what all may rightly wonder at, and cannot doubt, that the Spirit is over Christ; and that just as he sent the Spirit, so the Spirit sent the Son of God. For the Son of God says: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me, he has sent me to evangelize the poor' (Is. LXI. 1)... And well did he say 'upon me,' because he was speaking as the Son of man; for as the Son of man he was both anointed and sent to preach the gospel. But if the Son is not believed, let them also hear the Father speaking, that the Spirit of the Lord is over Christ. For (the Father) says to John: 'upon whom you see the Spirit descending from heaven...' Nor again should it disturb that he said 'over him'; for he was speaking of the Son of man, because as the Son of man he was baptized. For according to divinity the Spirit is not over Christ, but in Christ; because just as the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father (through communication and unity of nature or through immanent generation), so the Spirit of God, both the Spirit of Christ, is both in the Father and in the Son (through immanent procession), because he is the Spirit of the mouth. For he remains in God (the Father) who is from God, as it is written: 'but we have received the Spirit who is from God' (1 Cor. II. 12); and he remains in Christ, who has received from Christ, because again it is written: 'he will receive

from what is mine' (Jn. XVI. 14) ([20])... Therefore according to the divinity of Christ, he is not over Christ, because the Trinity is not over itself." After the holy doctor had shown in this way that the Holy Spirit is not greater than the Son according to divinity, although he can be said to be greater than Christ according to humanity, according to which the incarnate Son is sent not only by the Father but also by the Spirit; from this very mission he demonstrates the divinity of the Holy Spirit, because the Son of God, the firstborn of all creation, to whom all power in heaven and on earth has been given, cannot be sent even according to humanity except by God. Therefore from the fact that the Son sends the Holy Spirit, the Arians do not rightly infer that the Spirit is lesser than the Son, because the Spirit in turn sends the incarnate Son by his power, which cannot be except divine power. This is the context of the words which Macarius cited in isolation. For immediately after those things which we have described concerning mission according to humanity, Ambrose adds these: "Who is it who says: 'The Lord God and his Spirit have sent

---

[20] Ambrose expressly teaches that the Son is the source of the Holy Spirit in this same work On the Holy Spirit, Book I, chapter 15, n. 152: "Receive now how, just as the Father is the source of life, so also many have remembered the Son signified as the source of life, in that with you, he says, God almighty, your Son is the source of life, that is, the source of the Holy Spirit, because the Spirit is life." That many, but not all, understand the Son as the source of life in Ps. 35:10, this diversity does not indeed refer to the doctrine itself that the Son with the Father is the source of life, but only to the interpretation of the words of that psalm. Hence in express words in the same place (On the Holy Spirit Book I, n. 120) Ambrose says: "The Holy Spirit also, when he proceeds from the Father and Son, is not separated from the Father, is not separated from the Son. For how can he be separated from the Father, who is the Spirit of his mouth? which indeed expresses both the indication of eternity and the unity of divinity."

me': except him who came from the Father to save sinners? Whom, as you hear, the Spirit also sent, lest when you read that the Son sent the Spirit, you should believe the Spirit to be of inferior power. Therefore both the Father sent the Son and the Spirit (in the manner he had said above); the Spirit also both the Father sent and the Son (because from what was said before, the Spirit is of the Father and Son, proceeding from the Father and receiving from the Son)... If therefore the Son and Spirit send each other mutually (though for different reasons), just as the Father sends, this is not the injury of subjection but community of power" (Ambrose, On the Holy Spirit, Book III, chapter 1).

In another place Macarius brings forward a statement from the book On the Symbol, chapter 10. Both here on p. 334 and below on p. 373 he cites words from the Roman edition, in which the book is attributed to Ambrose. He also acknowledges that in the Maurist edition the text is different. Let us therefore grant this to Macarius, and let us examine the doctrine of this author according to that edition which pleases the adversary. The author has proposed as his only aim in that chapter 10 to defend against the Arians the unity of essence in the Father and Son and Holy Spirit. Among other things there he teaches that from the procession and mission of the Holy Spirit the distinction of persons is indeed demonstrated; but at the same time the unity of nature is preserved. "Therefore of one (God) who completes all things, and in whom are all things, knowledge is proclaimed in these words under the mystery of the holy Trinity; for the Son says: 'The Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father.' He says 'proceeds from the Father' on account of origin; he says 'whom I will send' on account of the fellowship and unity of nature." Now I say, if this reading were true, in the second clause, "whom I will send," it would necessarily have to be said that the Father is included: whom I will send equally as the Father, because there is one nature and

therefore one power of sending the Spirit in me and in the Father; but mission presupposes in divine things the communication of nature from the one sending into him who is sent; and consequently active mission common in the Father and Son, and passive mission (as they speak) in the Spirit shows not only in the Father and Son sending, but also in the Spirit sent, fellowship and unity of nature. Hence also in the first clause, where the author treats of the distinction of the Holy Spirit from the other persons through origin, the Spirit is understood to proceed from the Father, as the Father with the Son is one principle of the Holy Spirit. Indeed in the same Roman edition, which Macarius prefers to the Maurist, it is said expressly: "The Father begot the Word coeternal and co-omnipotent with himself, with whom he produces the Spirit" (ch. 1). "The Holy Spirit is truly Spirit, proceeding indeed from the Father and Son; but he is not the Son himself, because he is not generated; nor the Father, because he proceeds from both, not begotten, not unbegotten, not made... But what is neither born nor made is the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father and Son" (ch. 3). The same dogma is found in chapter 4.

Perhaps now Macarius will regret having preferred the Roman edition; let us therefore concede to him the transition to the Maurist reading. There the words to which he appeals are very simple: "Therefore of one (God) who completes all things, and in whom are all things, knowledge is proclaimed in these words under the mystery of the holy Trinity; for the Son says: 'The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father; nevertheless on account of the fellowship and unity of nature he is sent by the Son.'" How active mission and the power of sending common to the Son with the Father, and passive mission in the Holy Spirit demonstrates fellowship and unity of nature, we have said enough. But that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, all Catholics profess, although he proceeds from the Father insofar as he is one principle with the Son of the proceeding Spirit. This

communion of spiration in the Father and Son Pseudo-Ambrose demonstrates most clearly, even as the Maurist reading has it. "One (the Father) loving him (the Son) who is from him; and one loving him from whom he is; and that very love itself one of both, that is, the Holy Spirit... Therefore the Holy Spirit is not begotten, but is the sweetness, sanctity and eternity of the begetter and begotten (that is, the eternal sweetness or charity and sanctity of both) ([21]). For since the Father is spirit, and the Son is spirit; and the Father is holy, and the Son is holy: nevertheless it is said properly of the Spirit that he is the Holy Spirit. Because therefore he is coeternal, and common to both, he himself is called what both are" (ch. 1) ([22]).

β) There follows in Macarius a text from St. Jerome, from which he undertakes to persuade that a divine person is sent by another person only through unity of essence. According to his interpretation Jerome would have said: "The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and on account of the fellowship of nature is sent by the Son." Allowing this version, Jerome would say nothing other than what Christ had taught in Jn. XV. 26: "whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father." Only what Christ indicated by those words, "I will send from the Father," Jerome declares distinctly. Because there is fellowship of nature of the Son with the Father through communication from the Father into the Son, by that very fact there is also community between the Father and Son in relation to the Holy Spirit, and consequently in the power of sending the same Spirit. Therefore not the Father alone sends, but the Son also sends from the Father on account of fellowship of nature. Consequently also in the first clause it is said that the Spirit proceeds

[21] From Augustine, Trinity VI, n. 7; XV, n. 31.

[22] From Augustine, On the Trinity V, n. 12.

from the Father, as the Father in relation to the Holy Spirit is one with the Son on account of fellowship of nature (see Thesis XXXIV).

Moreover, if we read Jerome himself in context, he is really treating of one and the same thing in the first and second clause. For in the first he is not speaking directly of the procession of the Holy Spirit ad intra, but of the going forth ad extra or of the mission from the Father, which according to the certain opinion of the holy doctor presupposes and includes procession ad intra, and cannot be understood without this, in the same way that the going forth of the Son from the Father is understood in those words of Christ the Lord: "I came forth from the Father and have come into the world." Jerome has it thus: In the words of Is. LVII. 16, "the spirit will go forth from my face, and I will make the breath," some "understand the Holy Spirit, who in the beginning was borne over the waters and gave life to all things, who goes forth from the Father, and on account of the fellowship of nature is sent by the Son, saying:... 'when the Paraclete comes whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who goes forth from the Father.' Nor should it scandalize anyone, if the Spirit is said to go forth from the Father, since the Son also said of himself: 'I went forth from the Father, and have come; for I did not go forth from myself, but he sent me'" (Jerome, Book XVI on Is. LVII. 16).

Clear is Jerome's meaning. The Holy Spirit goes forth from the Father; on account of the unity of nature of the Son with the Father the same power is also of the Son in relation to the Spirit, whence he is also sent by the Son. Going forth from the Father is the relation of the Spirit sent to the Father sending; mission from the Son is the same relation (in reverse order) of the Son sending to the Spirit sent; in that going forth procession is included, therefore also in this identical mission the same procession is contained. This meaning will appear still more evidently to one reading the book of Didymus On

the Holy Spirit, nn. 25-26, from Jerome's own translation, from which he transferred these things into his commentary on Isaiah ([23]). For in this book the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as from the Father is expressly maintained. Concerning the Spirit of truth, who is sent by the Father and is the Paraclete, the Savior who is truth says: "for he will not speak from himself; this is, not without me and without the will of me and the Father, because he is inseparable from my and the Father's will; because he is not from himself, but is from the Father and me, for this very thing that he subsists and speaks is from the Father and me. I speak the truth, that is, I inspire (by communication of nature) what speaks, since indeed he is the Spirit

[23] He wrote the commentary on Isaiah not before the year 411; he translated the book of Didymus around the year 386.

of truth (of the Son) (24)... The Holy Spirit also who is the Spirit of truth, and the Spirit of wisdom (subsisting, that is, of the Son, as he had said in the immediately preceding passages there), cannot hear from the Son speaking what he does not know, since (the Holy Spirit) is this very thing which is brought forth by the Son, that is, proceeding from truth, consoler flowing from consoler (25), God from God, Spirit of truth proceeding... 'The Paraclete will receive from what is mine.' Again here 'to receive,' that it may be fitting to the divine nature, must be understood... Since indeed the Son also is said

---

24 The editions of Martianaei and Vallarsii, carefully prepared from collation of manuscript codices and earlier editions, indicate absolutely no variant reading here. But Macarius finds [one] describing other schismatics. Whenever these men find in Peter Lombard, St. Thomas, and other Scholastics a citation from the Fathers which does not agree in all words with the purer editions we now have, they cry out fraud of the Latin theologians. But here they reject the purest editions, and say that the reading should be preferred which the monk Ratramnus seems to have had before his eyes (Macar. p. 399). But that reading of Ratramnus appears corrupt from the context itself. For he reads thus: "For he does not speak from himself, this is without me and without the will of me and the Father, because he is inseparable from my and the Father's will; for this very thing that he subsists and speaks, I the truth speak, that is, I inspire what speaks; since indeed he is the Spirit of truth" (Ratramn. against the Greeks, Book II, ch. 5). Moreover, even from this corrupt reading, and much more from all the other things that Didymus disputes, the Catholic dogma clearly shines forth. Those words "that the Spirit of truth subsists, I the truth speak," either have no meaning, or certainly this: I the truth speak (by breathing forth I produce) the Spirit of truth subsisting; as Ratramnus also understood.

25 He alludes to that passage Jn. XIV. 16: "he will give you another Paraclete," where Christ shows (says Augustine in his commentary on John, tract. 74, n. 4) himself also to be the Paraclete; whence the Spirit consoler flowing from the Son consoler, just as the Spirit God from God the Son.

to receive the same things from the Father by which he himself subsists. For the Son is nothing other except those things which are given to him by the Father (that is, the Son is not one thing and what is given to the Son by the Father another, but entirely this very thing), nor is the substance of the Holy Spirit other than what is given to him by the Son. But these things are said (concerning the communication of the whole essence from the Father into the Son, from the Father and Son into the Holy Spirit) in order that we may believe there to be the same nature of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity which is of the Father and Son" (ibid. nn. 34-37).

γ) Finally Macarius for his opinion that mission is said only on account of the consubstantiality of the one sending and the one sent, with no consideration of procession, produces certain words of Cyril of Alexandria from Book XI, chapter 10 on John (that is, on Jn. XVII. 18-19): "Again he (the Spirit) bestows as his own gift the Son, on account of the identity of substance which he has with the Father."

After what we have said, there is no need to dwell on these things. We grant entirely that because the Son is one with the Father in nature, he is also one with the Father in the power of sending and bestowing the Holy Spirit; but the question is another, about which Cyril does not speak in express words in this place, namely whether the power of sending does not presuppose the spirative power, and consequently whether the Father and Son by the very fact that on account of consubstantiality between themselves they are one principle of mission, are not also, on account of the same consubstantiality, one principle of procession of the same Spirit. Nor indeed does Cyril say what Macarius supposed, that the mission of the Holy Spirit from the Son is founded on the consubstantiality of the Son with the Holy Spirit; but just as Ambrose and Jerome, Cyril also teaches what we have declared, that by reason of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, just as the nature so the

power of sending, and the very mission of the Holy Spirit itself is one in both.

Furthermore, Cyril in the context declares three things. First he says that the Holy Spirit is the proper Spirit of the Son just as he is the proper Spirit of the Father, because the Son is consubstantial with the Father, and therefore also in relation to the Holy Spirit has all things that are the Father's. Second, against the Macedonians he teaches that the Holy Spirit is God from the very substance of God and the Father, not created by the Son, but supplied by the Son to creatures. Third, on account of the same consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, the Holy Spirit is sent no less by the Son than by the Father. For the scope of Cyril in this place is not to distinctly hand down the procession and mode of procession of the Holy Spirit, but his mission from the Father and Son, in commentary on those words of the Lord: "as the Father sent me, so I send you."

But concerning mission and procession considered together Cyril treats, just as often elsewhere, so in these commentaries Book X on Jn. XV. 26; XVI. 12-13. His most express doctrine, as far as is sufficient, you have described in Theses XXXII and XXXV.

§ III.
Concerning the Divine Person who Receives From Another Person

Macarius disputes even more absurdly than in the preceding matters concerning that explicit teaching of Christ the Lord in John 16:13-15, which we expounded in Thesis XXXII.

1º He does not interpret the very words of Christ the Lord, but substitutes for them his own entirely different words. What the Lord said: "The Spirit of truth will teach you all truth; for he will not speak from himself, but whatever he hears, he will speak," Macarius

circumscribes with his own words; or rather (as I said) substitutes for Christ's words his own entirely different ones: "He will teach you all truth in my place; for the doctrine which he will teach you will not be his own peculiar doctrine, a new doctrine differing from mine."

But certainly, for a person who has only one divine nature not to speak from himself, but to hear what he speaks from another person, cannot signify anything other than the communication of wisdom and knowledge from one person to another, and thus the procession of one person from another. From this communication there follows, just as consubstantiality, so also the identity of knowledge and doctrine in both persons. This matter, sufficiently clear in itself, is explained not only by Augustine (Thesis XXXII) but also by other Fathers frequently. "He will speak nothing from himself... He will deliver nothing foreign to you; for he will not impose his own proper laws upon you; but since he is my Spirit and as it were my mind, he will speak entirely what is in me... This will be a sign to you that the Spirit is entirely from my substance (ἐκ τῆς ἐμῆς οὐσίας) and like my mind (καὶ οἷον ἐμὸς ἐστι νοῦς), that he will predict future things just as I do... For he could not, as I do, predict future things, unless he is also in me, and proceeds through me (δι' ἐμοῦ προϊόν), and is of the same substance with me."(26) Cyril on John 16:12-13, pp. 925-926. We have seen above the explanation of Didymus, which is undoubtedly also Jerome's. "He will not speak from himself... because he is not from himself, but is from the Father and me; for this very thing that he subsists and speaks is from the Father and me" - On the Holy Spirit, n. 34.

---

26 A little above he had said: "He calls the Spirit of truth, that is, his own (for he himself is truth), the Paraclete. For the Holy Spirit is in no way understood to be alien from the substance of the Only-begotten, but proceeds naturally from it" (οὐ γὰρ ἀλλότριον τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ μονογενοῦς τὸ ἅγιον νοεῖται πνεῦμα, πρόεισι δὲ φυσικῶς ἐξ αὐτῆς).

The following clause: "He will glorify me, because he will receive from what is mine, and will announce it to you," is transformed by Macarius into this other: "He will continue to teach you the same doctrine that I taught."

But what the Russian says in his own words certainly follows from what Christ said; yet this differs far from that, just as a principle differs from some particular consequence of it. From 1 John 5:7 "these three are one," the unity of testimony indeed follows; but it is not therefore permitted to substitute for the Apostle's words these others: "three are those who testify to one thing." Now Macarius in his art of interpreting follows entirely this method, which once adopted, anything can be proved from anything, and therefore nothing from everything. But concerning the divine person who receives from another person, we have sufficiently demonstrated in the Theses of our Treatise that this can be said and understood only according to communication from one person to another, and consequently according to the relationship of principle and what proceeds from a principle.

Finally, the third clause: "All things that the Father has are mine; therefore I said that he will receive from what is mine, and will announce it to you," the Photian perverts in such a way that even the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, most clearly expressed in this place, is eliminated. For this, he says, refers uniquely to the doctrine which the Son, insofar as he is man, received from the Father. But since not even this is sufficient to completely exterminate the clear sense of Christ's words, seeing that the Holy Spirit is certainly said to receive something from the Son, Macarius has borrowed a new and indeed remarkable distinction (like most other things) from Theophanes Prokopovich. For in the Holy Spirit himself they introduce a distinction, insofar as he is God, and insofar as he is the successor of the Son on earth, as Macarius says, or insofar

as he is a legate operating externally, as Prokopovich speaks (On the Procession of the Holy Spirit, ch. 11, §. 183). Insofar as he is God, they say, the Spirit can receive nothing; insofar as he is the successor of the Son on earth, he receives doctrine from the Son.[27]

If this new invention is admitted, two natures of the Holy Spirit must be established entirely, no differently than of the incarnate Word; or certainly from this Photian doctrine it will be most easily proved that the world was not created by God insofar as he is God, but insofar as he operates externally, as if God does not operate externally as God. If perhaps they should say that they distinguish from the Holy Spirit as he is God only the external work itself, they would fall into another absurdity. For it is not the work and effect, but the very person whom these call the successor of Christ and the legate operating externally, or as Christ says, the very Spirit of truth himself who is said to receive something from the Son.

---

[27] "These words: 'he will receive from what is mine,' and these: 'all that my Father has is mine,' refer exclusively to the doctrine that the Son, insofar as he came to earth to fulfill there the will of the heavenly Father regarding the salvation of humans, had received from the Father, and which the Holy Spirit, insofar as he is the successor of the Son on earth in the same work of salvation, was to receive from the Son" - Macarius, p. 337. Good God! The Holy Spirit is said to receive something from Christ insofar as he is man, and to be the legate of Christ the man? But Christ insofar as he is man does not give to the Spirit but receives from the Holy Spirit doctrine and other gifts of human nature: nor insofar as he is man does he send but is sent by the Holy Spirit. But truly, insofar as all things that are the Father's belong to the Son, therefore insofar as he is God from God, the Holy Spirit receives these same things from the Son himself; insofar as Christ is man, he was conceived by the Holy Spirit and anointed by the Holy Spirit; insofar as he is God, he says: "I send the Spirit of truth"; insofar as he is man, he says: "I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete."

Furthermore, the reason why the Holy Spirit receives from the Son is not that invented by Macarius, that Christ as man received doctrine from the Father, concerning which doctrine of Christ the man the Holy Spirit receives; but the Son evidently speaks of himself with divine predicates, and therefore according to his divine nature. "Because all things whatever the Father has are mine" (yet so that he remains Father, this one Son; and therefore all things are in the Father uncommunicated, in the Son communicated except the formal relationship of paternity); "therefore I said that (the Spirit of truth) will receive from what is mine." (28) The Spirit certainly receives from the Father both essence and knowledge, and in relation to external operation and doctrine; but all things whatever are the Father's, and therefore specifically that concerning which the context directly treats, namely the power of communication into the Holy Spirit, are mine; therefore, that is, on account of the identity of the Father and Son in all things (except the mutual relationship of paternity and filiation), the Spirit of truth, because he receives from what is the Father's, that is, from the Father, also receives in the same way from what is mine, that is, from me. The infinite truth formally as it is in the Father, and the same numerically identical truth formally as it is in

---

[28] Theophanes Prokopowicz, an apostate from the Catholic Church, Protestant in his fundamental principle regarding Scripture and Tradition, and schismatic in his role as Archbishop of Novgorod, speaks even more plainly and all the more absurdly. He says: The words of the Lord Christ, "My doctrine is not mine"; "you seek to kill me, a man who has spoken the truth to you," express the office of a legate or envoy. But if you say that these things are said of Christ as man, and thus must be understood in a different sense, I reply: even that statement, "He will not speak from Himself, He will take from what is mine," was spoken of the Holy Spirit, not as God, but as legate and operating ad extra, that is, externally. Prokopowicz in the cited place.

the Son, is communicated to the Spirit of truth. This communication is spiration, this reception is procession; therefore there is one spiration, one procession of the Spirit of truth from the Father and the Son.

But Macarius supposes an absurd fiction in Catholics, as if we would say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from eternity ignorant; and then, having supposed the procession of a divine person who is simultaneously ignorant (!!), receives knowledge from the Son. Because this evidently contradicts, he concludes from this that those words "he will receive from what is mine" cannot have any other sense than this: "The Holy Spirit will continue after me to teach you my doctrine and no other."[29]

But certainly the fact that one divine person receives knowledge and doctrine from another divine person neither signifies immediately a relationship to external things, nor can it signify only that one person teaches the doctrine of another person. For evidently there is signified both reception in one person and communication in

---

[29] "This expression: 'he will receive from what is mine, and will announce it to you' (the article 'the' is not in the gospel), should not be understood thus: the Holy Spirit will draw from me what he did not know and did not have before, for the Spirit, insofar as he is God, knows all things and possesses all things from all eternity. But here is how it must be understood (that is, how it is necessary to change Christ's words into entirely different ones, so that the Photian heresy may be preserved): he will continue after me to teach you my doctrine, and not another" - p. 337. Restricting that precious clause "insofar as he is God," he warns us according to some other relationship, namely according to that by which he is the successor of Christ on earth, that the Holy Spirit does not know all things!! From which certainly two natures of the Holy Spirit must be fabricated; for without this fiction the Holy Spirit certainly knows all things, teaches all things, works all things, insofar as he is God, because he is nothing other than God.

another, and therefore a relationship within the Trinity. From this communication there follows, just as consubstantiality within the Trinity, so also unity of operation externally and therefore also of doctrine.

If furthermore the Macarian fiction could have come to the minds of Catholics, that one person, having already supposed procession and subsistence, is still destitute of some perfection, for example knowledge, and receives this knowledge subsequently from another person, certainly from the fact that the Holy Spirit subsisting would receive knowledge from the Son, they could not have proved the procession of the same Spirit from the Son. But the matter is most clear both in itself and from the explicit explanation of the Fathers. The Father teaches the Son by generating him wise, that is, by generation communicating to the Son the essence under the formal relationship also of infinite wisdom; therefore the Son receives this from the Father by being born. So also the Father and Son breathe forth the Spirit of truth wise by communicating the essence, which is the very infinite truth and wisdom; therefore he receives this from the Father and Son by proceeding eternally (see Thesis XXXII).

Therefore let Macarius beware of proposing to men of sound mind his dilemma: that the Spirit receives knowledge from the Son either signifies that one subsisting in ignorance receives knowledge from the Son, or signifies simply delivering to men the doctrine of the Son. For neither the first is signified, because it is absurd in itself, nor the second, because it contradicts the words themselves; but it signifies that by the communication of divine knowledge which is the divine essence, the Spirit proceeds eternally from the Son.

Simply concerning procession from the Son, that "he will receive from what is mine," Epiphanius among others interprets in the same significance by which the Spirit in John 15:26 is said to proceed from the Father, so that, just as the Son is from the Father, God from

God by procession according to substance, equally the Holy Spirit is from the Son, and therefore from the Father and Son by procession according to substance. "If Christ is believed to be from the Father, God from God, also the Spirit (is or is to be believed to be) from Christ, or from both, just as Christ testifies: 'who proceeds from the Father'; and: 'he will receive from what is mine'" - Epiphanius, Ancoratus, n. 67.([30]) More distinctly the same thing is declared by Didymus in words already described above. "The Holy Spirit also, who is the Spirit of truth (of the Son) and the Spirit of wisdom, cannot hear what he does not know when the Son speaks, since (the Spirit) is this very thing which is brought forth by the Son, that is, proceeding from truth, consoler flowing from consoler, God from God, Spirit of truth proceeding... Indeed, the Son is also said to receive the same things from the Father by which he himself subsists. For the Son is nothing other except these things which are given to him by the Father; nor is there any other substance of the Holy Spirit besides what is given to him by the Son. But these things are said (concerning the communication of substance and all perfections from the Father into the Son, from the Son as from the Father into the Spirit), so that we may believe the same (numerically identical) nature of the Holy Spirit to be in the Trinity, which is of the Father and Son" - Didymus (with Jerome as interpreter) On the Holy Spirit, n. 37. So also Cyril explains that "he will receive from what is mine," comparing the procession of the Spirit from the essence of God (Father and Son) through communication of the whole essence with the procession of

[30] Εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς πιστεύεται, θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων, ὡς φησιν ὁ Χριστός· ὁ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ οὗτος ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται. ("But if Christ is believed to be from the Father, God from God, also the Spirit is from Christ or from both, as Christ says: 'who proceeds from the Father,' and 'he will receive from what is mine.'")

odor or quality from flowers. Whence he concludes: "It is entirely beyond reproach and beyond calumny that the Spirit is said to receive something from the Only-begotten; for proceeding naturally through him, as his proper Spirit, with all things which he has perfectly, he is said to receive what are his (the Son's)" προϊὸν γὰρ δι' αὐτοῦ φυσικῶς, ὡς ἴδιον αὐτοῦ. μετὰ πάντων ὧν ἔχει τελείως, λαμβάνειν λέγεται τὰ αὐτοῦ - Cyril on John, p. 930. "In that nature where there is supreme and true simplicity, in this the Son sees what the Father does, and the Holy Spirit hears what the Son says with the Father, because by communion of the natural essence both the Son exists born from the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. This therefore is for the Holy Spirit to hear (or receive), which is to proceed from the nature of the Father and Son; and this is to speak (or announce), which is to intimate ineffably to our hearts through grace" - Fulgentius to Fabianus, fragment 25.

2º It could easily be expected that the Photian nonsense concerning the form of future time, "he will receive from me, and will announce to you," would be brought forth again onto the stage and embellished by Macarius; concerning which matter we have said enough in Thesis XXXII.

a) The Holy Spirit, says our pneumatomachus, will receive in the future after Christ's ascension, just as he will glorify in the future, and will announce; but the procession is from eternity. <Heterodox theologians (i.e., those who condemn the Photian heresy) are accustomed to observe that eternity in the Scriptures is expressed equally through the form of present, past, or future; but this hypothesis has long since been refuted by one of their own (Lampe in John T. III. p. 321. Amsterdam 1726). When, however, the same theologians concede that the discourse in this place is chiefly about the procession of the Holy Spirit ad extra founded upon the procession ad intra, by this very fact they confess that in these words

at least there is no direct treatment of procession ad intra; but that this must be deduced solely from the procession ad extra as its foundation. But, he says, we have already seen that the mission of the Holy Spirit from the Son by no means presupposes procession from the same. So he says.

After what has been demonstrated by us thus far, these rehashed exceptions scarcely need a response. Among those three words "will receive," "will glorify," "will announce," there is the greatest difference. In the first is directly declared the reception of some thing or perfection in one divine person from another, and consequently in turn the communication from this person to that one, although this perfection, one in number both in the communicating person (i.e., in the Son) and in the person receiving from the Son (i.e., in the Holy Spirit), connotes obliquely a work ad extra, which begins in time. The other two words "will glorify," "will announce" signify per se neither communication nor relation of one person to another, but only operation ad extra and work in time. Hence no less correctly is the Father said to glorify the Son than the Son the Father (31); yet the Father does not receive from the Son, but the Son receives from the Father. In the same way the Holy Spirit <receives from the Son all things which he has perfectly; but the Son, considered according to his divinity, does not receive from the Holy Spirit. It is therefore utterly false in the first place what Macarius says, that this word "to receive," according to Catholic confession, is to be understood or can be understood in its direct signification of procession ad extra. Indeed, where a person having only one divine nature is said to receive or accept something from another divine person, that directly neither

---

31 Not only does the Son reveal the Father's glory, but the Father also reveals the Son's glory; nor does only the Holy Spirit manifest the Son's, but the Son also manifests the dignity of the Holy Spirit. Augustine, cont. serm. Arian, n. 12.

signifies nor can signify anything other than communication from one person to another. But since, on account of the very divine simplicity, whatever a divine person has as communicated is identified with the divine essence, a divine person cannot in any way be understood to receive something from another without thereby being said to receive the communicated divine essence, which reception is the very procession itself. For there is no other substance of the Holy Spirit besides that which is given to him by the Son. >>

Furthermore, in God operation, insofar as it is considered immanent, is the very divine essence with connotation of an effect ad extra, which begins in time. And therefore the Son from the Father, the Spirit from the Father and Son receives essence also under the formal aspect of operation, or proceeds with respect to an effect existing in time. Hence when one person is said to receive essence from another, this can be signified also under the formal aspect of communicated operation, and therefore obliquely there can be had, and in the place which we are treating there is really had, a respect to an effect in time.

This alone is what both all other Catholics concede and teach and the distinguished Father Perrone (Trin. c. 5. Propos. I. n. 338. 339. 353), to whom Macarius appeals; but no one has ever said what he himself says, that "to receive from the Son" directly and formally signifies mission from the Son. By what right he then glories that he has demonstrated the mission of a divine person to be independent of procession, we have examined above.

Finally, from those things which the adversary says about the comparison of time, whether past or future, with eternity, it becomes manifest that he himself is destitute of any genuine notion of the matter about which he speaks. Let him count Protestant Lampe and the others, whether Rationalists or other sectarians, whom he is accustomed frequently to introduce against Catholic doctrine, not

among ours but, at least regarding the fundamental principle of rebellion, among his own, and let him keep them for himself. But among those whom Macarius calls heterodox are the holy Fathers and ancient doctors no less Greek than Latin, indeed the very Apostle John himself. For thus he declares the name of God יהוה "who is, ὁ ὤν": ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁ ὤν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος [from him who is, and who was, and who is to come] Apoc. I. 4. 8; IV. 8. From this Justin Martyr learned what he says: "this voice, 'who is' ὁ ὤν, signifies not one time only but three, past, present and future" (οὐχ ἕνα μόνον χρόνον ἀλλὰ τοὺς τρεῖς, τὸν τε παρεληλυθότα, καὶ τὸν ἐνεστῶτα, καὶ τὸν μέλλοντα) [not one time only but the three, both the past, and the present, and the future] Justin, Cohort. ad Graec. n. 25. Clement of Alexandria interprets the name of God: "who alone essentially is, who was, is, and will be, according to which three times is placed the one name 'who is'" (τὸν μόνον ὄντως ὄντα, ὃς ἦν καὶ ἔστι καὶ ἔσται, καθ᾽ ὧν τριῶν χρόνων ἓν ὄνομα κεῖται ὁ ὤν) [the one who alone truly is, who was and is and will be, according to which three times one name is placed, "the one who is"] Clement, Paedagog. I. (ed. Paris. p. 118. ed. Potter p. 140). Still more explicitly speaks the common Dionysius, indicating that all these times are predicated of divine things, insofar as we compare the existence of mutable creatures with immutable eternity. For in the very eternity of God nothing is past or future, indeed properly not even present, because it is above every measure of time; but seeing in mobile creatures past, present, and future, we apply these to the immobile eternity of God, under which those three times run. In the Scriptures, he says, "the essentially pre-existing according to every notion of existing (created) things is predicated in multiple ways, and 'is' and 'was' and 'will be' is properly sung of him; for the beginning and middle and end of those things which exist, he has anticipated absolutely and eminently in himself" Dionysius, de divin. nomin. c. 5. §. 8. (see Tract. de Deo uno Th. XXII. n. I.).

Concerning the very communication by which the Holy Spirit will hear and receive from the Father and Son, Augustine explains this indifference of tenses in the eternity of hearing and reception (see texts in Th. XXXII). "For words of time are said indifferently, although eternity is understood to remain without time. For both he has received because he proceeded from the Father, and he receives because he proceeds from the Father, and he will receive because he will never cease to proceed from the Father; just as God both is and was and will be, and yet has neither beginning nor end of time, neither had nor will have" Augustine, cont. serm. Arian. n. 20.

Moreover, in the cited Thesis we have sufficiently declared why the eternal reception of truth and knowledge is expressed by a word of future time; namely, on account of the respect of the same communicated knowledge to the teaching to be infused by the Spirit of truth to the Apostles and the Church. "The Holy Spirit hears from the Father and Son, because he proceeds from the Father and Son in the equality of common divinity... To this certainly pertains what he says: 'he will glorify me, because he will receive from mine, and will announce to you.' Was it perhaps said 'he will receive' as if those things which he was to teach the Apostles, the Holy Spirit had not yet received? How absurd and impious this would be, I have demonstrated above. It was therefore said 'because he will receive from mine' as if it were said: when he begins to teach you as God, he will show that all things which he will teach you, he has from mine" Fulgentius, cont. Fabian. fragm. 27.

3º Finally, Macarius in his commentaries on this very place John XVI. 13-15, which we are treating, could not restrain himself from that unworthy scurrility already expunged above. If all things, he says, whatsoever the Father has, are also the Son's, it would follow from this that the Son would be unbegotten, and would have

begotten himself; conversely the Father would be begotten, and (as he adds in this place) would be incarnate like the Son.

But it remains forever in eternity what truth said: "all things whatsoever the Father has are mine; therefore I said that he will receive from mine." Three things are said in these words. a) In the Trinity there is the Father of the Son, and the Son of the Father, or the first person the Father begets the second person the Son: the Father has, and I the Son have, which he said in other words John X. 30: "I and the Father are one." Therefore by paternity, with which is identified the notion of the first person or being unbegotten, and by filiation are constituted distinct persons. b) By this alone formal notion and relation of Father to Son, of Son to Father are they distinguished; for "all things whatsoever the Father has are also the Son's, are mine," with only the distinction remaining through the relations of the first person begetting and the second begotten by that one, which he himself expressed in another place "I (the Son) and the Father are one." c) Among all these things, that which was the scope of this entire segment in Christ's discourse is expressed in explicit words as one and common to both, namely the relation of principle to the third person, the Holy Spirit: "all things whatsoever the Father has are mine; therefore I said that he will receive from mine."

Hence from these very words, by which directly the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, and obliquely, because the Son has all things from the Father, procession also from the Father is declared, the holy doctors are accustomed to demonstrate against the Arians that the Holy Spirit proceeds not from the Son alone, but also from the Father, and thus from the essence of Father and Son, not however as a creature of the Son. The Arians had said: the Son is begotten by the Father (by improper generation), the Holy Spirit is made by the Son. Augustine responds: "But what he said 'he will receive from mine' resolves the question itself, lest it be thought that

the Holy Spirit is from him (the Son alone) by certain degrees in the way that he himself is from the Father (alone); since both are from the Father, the one is born, the other proceeds... Therefore lest this be thought, as I said, he immediately added: 'all things which the Father has are mine, therefore I said he will receive from mine.' Thus doubtless wishing it to be understood that he receives from the Father; but therefore from his (namely from the Son's, which Christ said directly), because all things which the Father has (and among all these things the relation of principle to the Holy Spirit) are his. But this is not diversity of nature, but commendation of one principle" (32) Augustine, cont. serm. Arian. n. 19. "Therefore he received from the Son, and all things which the Father has are the Son's, which the Holy Spirit received; because he proceeds not from the Father alone, nor from the Son alone, but simultaneously from both... This procession is the property of the Holy Spirit alone from Father and

---

32 See the excellent explanation of this one principle in Augustine himself in John, tract. 99. n. 8.; de Trin. XV. n. 29. which we have described in Thesis XXXV.

Macarius dares on p. 338 to adduce this passage of Augustine from the book cont. serm. Arian. to demonstrate that the Fathers did not understand that "he will receive from mine" concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, but concerning his consubstantiality with the Son; for which he also brings forward some words from Pseudo-Athanasius (Dialog. I. cont. Macedonian. n. 16.). But Augustine and the other Fathers, disputing against the Arians in order to prove the divinity of the Holy Spirit and his procession from the substance of the Father, presupposed or explicitly assumed (as Augustine does in this place) the procession from the Son declared by these very words "he will receive from mine"; and thence from the following words, "all things whatsoever the Father has are mine," they demonstrated the procession of the same Spirit also from the Father, concerning which there was direct and principal controversy against those pneumatomachi.

Son, whose is the common nature with Father and Son (consubstantiality from procession)" Fulgentius, cont. Fabian. fragm. 27.

Finally, to those things which Macarius wrote in his dreaming about the incarnation of Father and Son, children will respond who have learned the rudiments of Christian doctrine. The Father begets the Son by communication of all things which are the Father's, except paternity alone, by which alone he is distinguished from the Son; and therefore all those things which are communicated to the Son by the Father are certainly also the Father's, from whom they are communicated. But the Father does not beget the Son by communicating human nature, and therefore the Son does not have human nature communicated by generation from the Father, but has it formed by one common operation of the Trinity in time and united to his singular and distinct hypostasis. Therefore, that all divine things communicated to the Son by generation are also of the Father communicating; from this only Photian logic will be able to infer the consequence that also all human things which are not communicated by generation from the Father, but are united in time by Father and Son and Holy Spirit to the hypostasis of the Word, will in the same way also be united to the hypostasis of the Father.

§ IV.
On the Relation by Which the Spirit is, & is Called, the Spirit of the Son

We treated in Thesis XXXII concerning the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son, from the declaration of the hypostatic property proposed in the Scriptures, that He is relatively Spirit, or spirated, just as much of the Father as of the Son—or, which amounts to the same (unless one wishes to deviate into the division of

Nestorius), the Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of Jesus. We adduced this doctrine of Christ and the Apostles not merely in passing, as Macarius thinks (p. 341), as though of lesser importance; but rather we assert it, from the common consensus of the holy Fathers, to be the manifest and express declaration of the origin of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. Macarius raises three objections.

1° He says that those things which are attributed to distinct persons are not necessarily to be understood as attributed to each for one and the same reason; thus, it could be said "the Spirit of the Father," because He proceeds from the Father, and "the Spirit of the Son" for another reason.

This principle of Macarius descends directly into the Arian heresy; indeed, it is the hermeneutical foundation upon which that entire heresy rests. They were not so dull as not to see that in the Scriptures the same things are attributed to the Son as to the Father; but they replied, in precisely the way Macarius now speaks, that such things could be understood as attributed to distinct persons for different reasons. In reality, however, whatever divine predicates are said of the persons of the Most Holy Trinity are either proper to one person alone (such as paternity, filiation, procession)—and these in Scripture are never attributed to another person, nor can they be attributed without Sabellian error; or else they are common to several persons (such as the relation of the Father and the Son to their Spirit, according to the express doctrine of Scripture)—and such are necessarily numerically one and indistinct in all the persons to whom they are attributed.

2° He repeats the Photius-style evasion, about which we have often spoken already, and what in it is true and what is false. It can be said "the Spirit of the Father and of the Son," he says, because He is consubstantial with the Father and the Son. But when the name Spirit signifies the third Person in the Trinity, it is necessarily relative,

meaning that He is breath (spiramen) or spiration (as Athanasius says) of the person from whom He is spirated, that is, He proceeds by spiration. Thus, just as "the Spirit of the Father," so also "the Spirit of the Son," in its direct signification, means spirated from the Father, spirated from the Son (τὸ πνεῦμα, ἡ πνοὴ καὶ εὐωδία). This interpretation you have confirmed by the common consensus of the Fathers in the Thesis cited. Now the immanent processions of the persons in the Most Holy Trinity indeed include consubstantiality, since procession neither is nor can be conceived except by communication of one numerically identical substance. "Whatever the Spirit has, He has from the Word" — Athan. Or. III contra Arian. n. 24. "Nor is the Spirit another substance beyond that which is given to Him by the Son" — Didym. n. 37. "The proper Spirit of the Son, together with all that He perfectly possesses, is said to receive the things that are His" — Cyrill. in Io. p. 930. "It belongs to the Holy Spirit alone, from the Father and the Son, to have this property of procession, whose nature He has in common with the Father and the Son" — Fulgent. fragm. 27.

Indeed, St. Basil explicitly, and other Fathers at least indirectly (as reported by Petavius, De Trin. l. VII, c. 14, n. 11), keeping in view the economy of the Most Holy Trinity, establish this general principle: two who are consubstantial cannot be said to be so on account of the mere unity of nature, if both have that nature communicated to them by a third; rather, for this, it is necessary that the nature be communicated from one to the other. Hence they say that brothers cannot properly be called consubstantial, nor could two persons in the Most Holy Trinity be consubstantial, even if they were supposed to have the same nature, unless one proceeds from the other. From this, through the very predication of consubstantiality between the Father and the Son, that calumny of the Arians is refuted, who interpreted the Catholic position as though it first supposed one

divine nature, which the Father and the Son shared without the Son's procession from the Father; in this way, says Basil, those two persons would be brothers, but by no means could consubstantiality between them be understood, which includes the origin of the one from the other. "For those who have the relation of brothers among themselves are not called consubstantial, as some have supposed; but when both the cause and that which has existence from the cause are of the same nature, then they are called consubstantial." (33) Basil. ep. 52 (al. 300) ad Canonicas n. 1.

Therefore, whoever denies that the Spirit proceeds from the Son denies that consubstantiality which alone the Fathers teach to be true in the Most Holy Trinity (whatever one may say of consubstantiality among creatures), and according to the mind of Basil simultaneously affirms between the Son and the Spirit the relation of brothers—an impiety which the same Fathers most frequently detest. Hence, moreover, Basil and other doctors together with him, whenever they proclaim the Spirit consubstantial with the Son, so often by the very nature of consubstantiality which they establish, profess the Son to be the principle of the Holy Spirit.

3° Macarius dares to invent that "the Spirit of the Father and of the Son" could be understood not as the divine Person, but only as His gifts. But in truth this is nothing other than to pervert the most manifest sense of Scripture, in which the Spirit of the Father and of the Son is everywhere distinguished as the cause of gifts, while the gifts themselves are everywhere distinguished as His effects—and thus, together with the Socinians and Rationalists, to deduce the denial of the very Person of the Holy Spirit. How the canons

---

33 Οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἀδελφὰ ἀλλήλοις ὁμοούσια λέγεται, ὅπερ τινὲς ὑπειλήφασιν, ἀλλ᾽ ὅταν καὶ τὸ αἴτιον καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ αἰτίου τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἔχον τῆς αὐτῆς ὑπάρχῃ φύσεως, ὁμοούσια λέγεται.

prescribe that the name spirit, when set forth without the article and without addition, is to be understood of gifts or created dispositions, but when with the article (τὸ πνεῦμα) or with an added determination, the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, the Spirit of the Father, the Spirit of the Son, is to be understood hypostatically of the third Person of the Most Holy Trinity—this St. Athanasius expounds at length in ep. I ad Serapionem n. 4ff. cf. Epiphanius, adversus haeres. l. III, haer. 74, n. 9. There is not a single Father who, in those places where the Spirit of the Father and the Son is celebrated, did not understand this to refer to the very Person of the Holy Spirit, so that those very Fathers to whom Macarius appeals, Basil (contra Eunom. V, p. 305) and John Damascene (hom. Sabbat. Sanct. n. 4), expressly declare that by this appellation the Person of the Holy Spirit and His relation to the Father and the Son is to be understood. I have cited Basil's passage in Thesis XXXIII; and why Damascene said that the Spirit of the Son proceeds not from the Son but from the Father through the Son, has been shown in Thesis XXXVI.

§ V.
On the Doctrine of the Fathers & Theologians From the Action of Christ (John 20:22)

The final argument of Macarius against the biblical testimonies concerns the certainly symbolic action of Christ the Lord, when "He breathed upon them (the Apostles) and said: Receive the Holy Spirit" (John 20:22). When he finds that this has been explained by Catholic theologians as a sign and symbol of the procession of the Spirit of the Son also from the Son, he dismisses it with great haughtiness. I will say nothing of his most "learned" observations, such as that from this it would follow that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from the Apostles, since they too, by the laying on

of hands, communicated the Holy Spirit to the faithful; ([34]) and further, that the human soul proceeds eternally from God, because it is written: "He breathed into his face the breath of life" (Gen. 2:7). Only one thing must not be passed over in silence, namely, that Macarius confidently asserts that "none of the holy Fathers found in that passage of the Gospel any signification of the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit." ([35])

But in fact Catholic theologians, in this explanation of the symbol, rely almost entirely on the authority of the holy Fathers, proposing not so much an interpretation of the text based on internal arguments, as the very judgment of the Fathers. Let us name some among the many. "Why then should we not believe that the Holy Spirit proceeds also from the Son, since He is likewise the Spirit of the Son? For if He did not proceed from Him, then, after the Resurrection, He would not have breathed upon His disciples, saying: Receive the Holy Spirit. For what does that breathing signify, unless that the Holy Spirit proceeds also from Himself?... If therefore the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, why did the Son say: who proceeds from the Father? Why do you think, except that He is accustomed to refer to the Father, and to what belongs to Him, from whom He Himself also is?" — August. in Io. tract. 99, n. 7–8; de Trin. IV, n. 29; XV, n. 45; contra Maximin. l. II, c. 14, n. 1. Fulgentius has the same in De Fide ad Petrum c. 11. Indeed, from John 20 together with Genesis 2, Athanasius (De Trin. et Spiritu Sancto n. 18–19, some of which I cited in Thesis XXXII) and Cyril (Thesaurus pp. 344–345) clearly teach the same. But note well: we are

---

[34] See on this St. Augustine, De Trin. XV, n. 46.

[35] Les Pères de l'Église insistèrent maintes fois sur cette expression de l'Évangile, et l'expliquèrent différemment... mais aucun d'eux ne trouva dans le texte cité l'idée de la procession éternelle de l'Esprit-Saint (p. 344).

not inquiring here concerning the immediate sense of the words of Scripture, but concerning the very reality which the Fathers held and handed down to us.

"From the beginning, when Adam was formed, He breathed into his face the Holy Spirit, as Moses says: and God breathed into the face of Adam the inspiration of life, and man was made into a living soul. And what the Lord breathed forth is not the soul, according to the fables of the Jews... but it is the life-giving Spirit (36)... Therefore, taught by Moses: the Lord breathed into the face of Adam the inspiration of life; hearing also the Savior saying: I am the Life; and Paul writing: God has sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts; seeing also the Only-Begotten breathing upon the face of the Apostles and saying: Receive the Holy Spirit — we are taught that the Spirit is the spiration of the Son in His own life and substance abiding... For this reason, however, the Spirit is not begotten by Him, because He is not His Word; but to say that the Spirit is created — far be it! Yet we have learned from Sacred Scripture that He is the spiration of the Son, and we call both the Father and the Son the source of the Spirit." — Athan. loc. cit. "It is impious to say that the Spirit of God is created or made... And for this reason He breathes Him into the face of the Apostles (ἐμφυσᾷ αὐτὸ εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον), saying: Receive the Holy Spirit, so that we may learn that the Spirit given to the disciples is from the fullness of divinity (ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος τῆς θεότητός ἐστι). For in Christ, says the Apostle, dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily... For this reason David sang to God: with You is the fountain of life, and in Your light we shall see light. For he knew that with God the Father the Son is the fountain of the Holy Spirit (οἶδε γὰρ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ ὄντα τὸν υἱὸν τὴν πηγὴν

[36] Cf. St. Basil, Contra Eunomium V, p. 307.

σοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος)." — De Incarn. contra Arian. n. 9. cf. Ambrose, De Spiritu Sancto l. I, n. 152, cited above.

Cyril demonstrates most excellently the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, because just as the Father, so also the Son sends and gives the Holy Spirit; and because He gives the Spirit as His own proper Spirit, therefore in the very mission itself is presupposed the procession of the Spirit from the substance of the Father and of the Son. Hence he shows that in that breathing of Christ the Son (John 20), by which is immediately signified the mission and bestowal of the Holy Spirit, there is also indicated His procession from the substance of the Son. "The Spirit is the Spirit of the Son; whence He called Him the Spirit of Truth, since He had just said of Himself in the preceding verses that He is the Truth... But how, if the Son is of another substance, does He hand over the Spirit of the Father as His own? For it is written that He breathed upon His disciples, saying: Receive the Holy Spirit. Does it not then follow most rightly, indeed must one firmly believe, that since the Son possesses the natural goods of God and the Father as essentially common, He has the Spirit in the same manner in which the Father is considered to have Him — not as acquired from elsewhere or from without (οὐκ ἔπακτον οὐδὲ ἔξωθεν)—for it is absurd, indeed mad, to think so; but just as each of us contains his own spirit (breath) within himself, and from his inmost being breathes it forth outwardly? For this reason Christ breathed corporally, showing that just as from the mouth of man the spirit (breath) comes forth corporeally, so from the divine substance the Spirit is poured forth divinely, who is from Him (Christ the Son)." ([37]) — Cyrill. in Io. p. 810.

---

[37] Δεικνὺς ὅτι καθάπερ ἐκ στόματος τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου πρόεισι τὸ πνεῦμα σωματικῶς, οὕτω καὶ ἐκ τῆς θειᾶς οὐσίας θεοπρεπῶς προχεῖται τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

Anastasius of Antioch draws the same argument from that symbolic action of Christ. "We have made it manifest that the hypostases are inseparable... since both the Father introduces His Son, and the Holy Spirit exists together with the Father and the Son, as with mind and Word. For the Lord, showing that He exists from Himself, breathed upon His disciples, saying: Receive the Holy Spirit." — Anast. Or. I de Trin. n. 27 (as interpreted by Turrianus, Migne T. LXXXIX, p. 1327). In the same oration he has things that agree with this: "Our Savior Jesus said of His consubstantial Paraclete, that while He proceeds indeed from the Father, He receives also from the Son, the Son making and possessing as His own all things that belong to the Father... There is a natural relation, and those things which are relatively ordered in some way mutually imply the others to which they are naturally related. Thus the Father implies the Son, and the Son the Father, and the one cannot be understood without the other... But the Word, since He is Son, simultaneously manifests the Spirit with Himself. For the Word is not without the Spirit, nor the mind without the Word. And we say the Mind is the Father of the Word; I mean the mind in which is the Word, with whom is the Holy Spirit, who is called the Spirit of the mouth of God; for the Son is the mouth of the Father." (ibid. n. 12, p. 1317). Again: "The prophet signifies three lights; one to whom he made his prayers (Ps. 25:10), this is the Father; and His light, the Son; and in the light, the light, the Holy Spirit.... The light before the face of God is the Holy Spirit, since the Only-Begotten is the face of God, of whom the Holy Spirit is the light." (ibid. n. 21, p. 1323). With these compare the statements of Theodore of Raithu ([38]): "The Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of His mouth, namely of God, because the Only-Begotten is the mouth;

[38] On the work of Theodore entitled Oratio dogmatica (or De rectis dogmatibus) cited by Veccus, see Allatius (Migne T. XCI, p. 1480).

and again, the Spirit proceeding from Him and sent forth not only from the Father but also from the Son... And indeed the Lord, showing that He exists from Himself, breathed upon His disciples, saying: Receive the Holy Spirit." ([39]) — cited in John Veccus, In Inscriptionibus ad sententias SS., in Laemmer, Bibliotheca selecta T. I, pp. 462, 570.

Now I appeal to you, the very schismatic disciples of Macarius, to judge of the good faith and learning of your master, when he dares obstinately to assert that "none of the Fathers (in the symbolic action of Christ the Lord) found any indication of the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit."

Thus I think that the foundations of the revealed dogma, both from the Scriptures themselves taken directly, and from them as interpreted according to Christian antiquity, have been sufficiently vindicated against the Photius-inspired artifices again put forward by Macarius. Nevertheless, since he delivers a long discourse about the monuments of Tradition—though composed without even the least subtlety, and laden with gross and obvious errors—we must speak about these also.

---

[39] Πνεῦμα στόματος αὐτοῦ, δηλονότι τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον λέγεται, στόματος ὄντος τοῦ μονογενοῦς· καὶ πνεῦμα πάλιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον καὶ ἀποστελλόμενον οὐ μόνον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ... καὶ μὴν ὁ κύριος ἐξ αὐτοῦ δεικνὺς αὐτὸ ὑπάρχειν, ἐμφυσῶν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἔλεγε, λάβετε πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.

SECTION II.

ON THE SOPHISTRIES BY WHICH, IN DEFENSE OF THE PHOTIAN DOCTRINE, AN APPEAL IS MADE TO THE DOCUMENTS OF ECCLESIASTICAL PREACHING

It seems that Macarius, Rector of the Ecclesiastical Academy of St. Petersburg, has placed his whole confidence in persuading by means of his pupils' ignorance, who—since they neither grasp the state of the question nor wish or are able to examine for themselves the testimonies of antiquity—will easily yield to bold assertion; and when they see citations heaped together from creeds, councils, and the holy Fathers teaching something about the procession of the Holy Spirit, they will suppose that immense weight lies in the sheer number of quotations, although in all of these the doctrine for which they are brought forward is neither explicitly proposed nor implicitly contained in such a way that it could be drawn out by analysis. Indeed, in those very documents that are cited, the Catholic dogma is understood either to be presupposed or implicitly contained, provided that the state of the question—which was then directed against heretics—the intended scope, and the doctrine expressly and

explicitly handed on elsewhere are kept in view. Let us consider the sum of the stratagems of error in the malice of men.

CHAPTER I.
ON THE ALLEGED PROOF OF THE PHOTIAN DOCTRINE FROM THE CREEDS OF FAITH

"All the ancient creeds in which this dogma is treated unanimously teach that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone." So Macarius asserts (40).

Yet in none of all the ancient orthodox creeds (41) is it taught —or, if the history of the heresy to which the creeds are directly opposed and the intended scope be considered, can it be deduced by

40 Macarius: « Tous les anciens symboles ou il est question de ce dogme, enseignent unanimement que le Saint-Esprit, procéde du Père seul » p. 345.

41 "Let the Photians have for themselves the creed of Theodore of Mopsuestia condemned at Ephesus; yet concerning its sense with respect to this chapter it probably appears orthodox: see Th. XXXVIII, no. II."

argument (42)—that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone. In those same creeds, concerning this dogma, the question whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son is either not treated at all—because this was assumed as the very state of the question—or, if it is treated explicitly, it is taught, albeit in other words, that He proceeds from the Son just as from the Father.

1º He adduces four creeds to demonstrate the unanimous consent for the Photian watchword of procession from the Father alone. Two of these are that of Gregory Thaumaturgus and another described by Epiphanius (in Ancoratus no. 120). But in both that creed of Gregory and especially in the other in Epiphanius there is not only no statement that the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone;

42 "Moreover, on Macarius' own principles, a deduction of this kind would not suffice; for he is wont to reproach Catholics (albeit falsely) for deducing their doctrine by argument; he demands from them express testimonies. Therefore, when he boasts with so expansive a promise of the unanimous doctrine of all the creeds concerning procession from the Father alone, he certainly promises express testimonies—of which he has none. There is no need to speak of Macarius' oft-repeated 'wise observation,' repeated elsewhere and again here, that the Son also is said to be begotten of the Father, without the addition of the particle 'from the Father alone'; nevertheless the Son is to be believed as begotten from the Father alone and not also from the Holy Spirit. One must indeed believe that the second Person is not begotten by the third, because the third is to be believed as proceeding from the second as well as from the first Person."

explicit doctrine is also handed down concerning procession from the Son ([43]), as we showed in Th. XXXV, no. I, and Th. XXXVIII, no. I.

The two remaining creeds cited by Macarius—one which Epiphanius inserted into his Ancoratus (no. 119), the other the solemn creed of the Council of Constantinople—are in truth not two but one and the same. In it, moreover, there is contained not what Macarius promised he would demonstrate from the alleged unanimity of the creeds, but the evangelical doctrine that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. Now between these two propositions —"The Spirit proceeds from the Father," which all Catholics profess, and another which is found in no document of the faith, "The Spirit proceeds from the Father alone," in opposition to the Son—between these propositions there is the same difference as between "The Father is God" and "The Father alone is God," in opposition to the Son; of which the former is assuredly Catholic, the latter heretical Arianism. We have demonstrated in Th. XXXIV, no. I, and Th. XXXVIII, no. I, by what reasoning the direct profession of procession from the Father

---

[43] "Macarius recites from that creed in Epiphanius: 'Nous croyons aussi au S. Esprit ... procédant du Père et reçu par le Fils (mais suivant d'autres manuscrits: recevant par le Fils).' But, in Photian fashion, he perverts the text both by the translation and by truncation. The creed says: οὕτως δὲ πιστεύομεν ἐν αὐτῷ, ὅτι ἔστι πνεῦμα ἅγιον ... ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ λαμβανόμενον (ἀλ. λαμβάνοντα, fortasse λαμβάνον τε) καὶ πιστευόμενον. It does not say, therefore, that the Spirit is 'received through the Son' nor 'receiving through the Son'; rather, it declares that the Spirit 'receives from the Son,' and that He is believed to be 'from the Son' (τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ πιστευόμενον). Namely, that word of John 16:15, ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται, is explained expressly in the sense of procession from the Son, as Epiphanius himself has done in several places: Ancoratus 67, 72; Haeres. 62, no. 2; 74, no. 10."

—inasmuch as the Father is one with the Son—was understood and was defined against the Semi-Arians who were Pneumatomachi.

With this, Macarius' collection of creeds "unanimously professing" the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Father alone" is concluded.

2º The adversary himself saw that the creed attributed to Athanasius, which long before Photius constituted the profession of universal faith in the Western Church, could not be suppressed in silence. He says, therefore, that the clause of this creed, "the Holy Spirit [is] not made nor created nor begotten, but proceeding from the Father and the Son," is found in very many Greek manuscripts without the phrase "and the Son," for which allegation he appeals "to a Western writer, namely to the apostate Marcus Antonius de Dominis" (44). He proves that the interpolation was made later by Latins from the fact that "before the fourteenth century no one in the West ever used this creed against the Greeks" (45).

Yet in our age the following points are beyond dispute for all the learned.

---

44 "This man [Marcus Antonius de Dominis], among other monstrosities, was also contriving this: to weld together, according to the Protestant system of fundamental articles, the Roman, the Anglican, and the Photian church, with many dogmas of faith, as it were, left in suspense; among which non-fundamental articles it pleased him also to place the dogma concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. The same monstrosity of parturition has been recently taken up in the Bonn conference by those Neo-Protestants, laughable unless they were more worthy of compassion, who ἀντιφραστικῶς σε 'vetere s catholicos' appellant."

45 « Avant le quatorzième siècle personne en occident ne cita jamais ce Symbolo contre les Grecs; preuve évidente et incontrastable qu'il était encore connu en nombre d'endroits sans ce supplément (et Filio), ou qu'on se faisait scrupule de citer un passage reconnu pour altéré », p. 349.

a) Innumerable Latin manuscripts containing this creed—some of which are earlier than the age of Photius—agree most fully among themselves, both in what concerns the rest (if you except a few variant readings of no moment) and in retaining this phrase "and the Son," without any discrepancy at all. The Greek manuscripts, both in the remaining context of the creed and with respect to retaining or suppressing this clause, differ from one another in a remarkable degree. The style itself betrays that the original text is Latin, and that in Greek there exists only a translation, and that a translation varying in different copies. These same Greek copies were all written after the Photian heresy had already been introduced. Hence among the more recent collectors of creeds who pursue with every effort the genuine readings, the non-Catholic August Hahn (Bibliotheca symbolorum 1842, p. 123) simply professes: since the Greek versions of this creed, which differ among themselves, are of no critical value, we shall give only the Latin text with variant readings which are generally of slight importance. Whoever, then, may be considered the composer of the creed—whether Athanasius (while he was in exile at Rome or Trier, as some think) or, much more probably, another Western doctor—the Latin text is genuine, and, in what concerns the profession about the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son, it has been preserved to us with perfect integrity; and outside the borders of Russia no one doubts this. From this it follows with certainty that in the Greek versions, wherever this phrase is suppressed, the mutilation was perpetrated in favor of the Photian heresy.

Indeed, the context itself proves the genuineness of the phrase; for there is an opposition between the generation of the Son, inasmuch as it is from the Father alone, and the procession of the Spirit, which is not from the Father alone, but from the Father and the Son. The text is evidently maimed if it were to read: "The Son is from the Father alone ... the Holy Spirit [is] from the Father." A

certain Greek little translator sensed this and concocted the fourth form edited by Montfaucon (Opera Athanasii, vol. II, p. 661), in which he also altered what is said of the Son in this way: "The Son is from the Father, not made, not created, but begotten; the Holy Spirit is from the Father, not made, not created, not begotten, but proceeding"—ὁ υἱὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐστιν ... τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐστιν οὐ ποιητὸν κτλ.

b) Appeal has been made to the same creed, as to a profession of faith of the whole Church—at least of the Latin Church—from the very beginnings of the Photian heresy.

Already before Photius, in the eighth century, Alcuin, in his booklet On the Procession of the Holy Spirit written to Charlemagne, cites among the testimonies of the Fathers Athanasius' Exposition of the Catholic Faith ([46]): "Blessed Athanasius ... in the Exposition of the Catholic Faith, which that distinguished doctor himself composed and which the universal Church confesses, declares the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, saying thus: 'The Father is from no one ... the Son is from the Father alone ... the Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son, not made nor created nor begotten, but proceeding.'" Alcuin, loc. cit., vol. I, p. 750.

Not long after Alcuin, at the beginning of the ninth century, when in Jerusalem that monk John—of whom it was said in Th. XXXIX, no. I—seems to have raised the first disturbances about the dogma against the Latin monks on the Mount of Olives, those monks, in a letter to Pope Leo III, were confirming the dogma by appealing both to other documents in which the faith in the Holy Spirit "proceeding from the Father and the Son" is expressed, and to

[46] "Sirmond notes (in the annotations to Theodulf's De Spiritu Sancto) that before Hincmar it was customary not to say 'creed,' but 'Faith of Athanasius' or 'Exposition of the Faith' (ἔκθεσις τῆς πίστεως) or 'Sermon on the Faith.'"

this very creed: "and in the Faith of holy Athanasius it says likewise" (Balusius, Miscellanea, II, p. 84).

At the same time (in the year 809) Theodulf of Orléans, by command of Charlemagne, gathered the opinions of the ancient Fathers on the Holy Spirit, namely that He proceeds from the Father and the Son; for (as he says in the preface to Charlemagne written in verse) "this is sung by the unanimous pious voice of the holy Fathers." Among the testimonies of Athanasius (which, moreover, are taken from the books of Vigilius of Thapsus On the Trinity), in the last place, to confirm that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, he recites the entire context from the creed, exactly as we now have it. Opera Sirmondi, vol. II, p. 702 (Venice ed., 1728).

In the time of Photius, moreover, those who first wrote against his heresy at the command of St. Nicholas I, Roman Pontiff, appealed to this same passage of the creed and transcribed it entire. Ratramnus places this very testimony first among the witnesses of the Fathers: "Athanasius ... in the booklet on faith which he published and proposed as to be held by all Catholics, among other things speaks thus: 'The Father is from no one ... the Son is from the Father alone ... the Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son, not made, not created, not begotten, but proceeding.'" Ratramnus, Contra Graecos, II, c. 3. Aeneas of Paris, in his book Against the Greeks, which consists entirely of contexts of the Fathers' opinions, after several other testimonies transcribed from Athanasius, adduces, as the last, from our creed, c. 19: "Likewise the same [Athanasius] in the Catholic Faith: that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and [from] the Son: 'The Father is from no one,'" with the rest as they are read in the creed.

In the twelfth century, Hugh Eterianus wrote at Constantinople in the very court of Manuel Comnenus and sent to Pope Alexander III three books on the heresies which the Greeks

charge against the Latins, full of learning and doctrine. There, book III, c. 21, he describes the opinions of Cyril, Athanasius, Gregory the Great (whose translation, he says, is not faithful among the Greeks), Epiphanius, and Damascene. From Athanasius one testimony seemed to him sufficient for all: "The great Athanasius, too, in the confession of his faith clearly asserts that there is procession from the Son; for he says: 'The Spirit [is] from the Father and the Son, not made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.'" Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum, vol. XXII, p. 1259.

What, then, shall we say of the rashness of a man celebrated among his own for learning, who deduces an "evident and irrefutable" argument for an interpolation of the Athanasian creed perpetrated by the Latins from this, that before the fourteenth century "it was never and by no one cited against the Greeks"?

CHAPTER II.

ON THE SAME ALLEGED PROOF FROM THE DOCTRINE OF THE COUNCILS

With brazen forehead, which we have already come to know, Macarius asserts: "All the ecumenical councils without exception, and, following their example, almost all the provincial councils which had the opportunity to treat this dogma, have unanimously recognized that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father" (47).

The proposition contradictory to Macarius' is absolutely true. On this dogma—concerning which the controversy exists

47 « Tous les Conciles oecuméniques sans exception, et à leur exemple presque tous les Conciles provinciaux, qui ont eu occasion d'aborder ce dogme, ont unanimement reconnus que le Saint-Esprit procéde seulement du Père », p. 350.

between the Photians and the Catholic Church, namely whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone or rather from the Father and the Son—there has never been any council, ecumenical or provincial (except for the schismatic pseudo-councils held from the time of Photius), in which the matter was treated and the very Catholic dogma was not declared and defined. But Macarius, along with the other schismatics, does not acknowledge the Lateran IV, Lyons II, and Florence; by this very denial they both overturn the whole divine constitution of the Church of Jesus Christ, and undermine the authority—derived from the assistance of the Holy Spirit—of all the ancient councils as well, and in particular of Constantinople I, to which, however perversely in this cause, they are wont to appeal most of all. For it is most manifest in history that that council was not ecumenical either in its convocation or in its celebration, and that it obtained this supreme authority only from the subsequent confirmation of the Roman Pontiff. But since we are not now dealing with other Photian errors, let us hear the unanimous—so it is feigned—testimony, concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone, of those councils which they themselves also admit.

§ I.
On the Seven Councils Held in the East

If the Russians believe Macarius, all the ecumenical councils —namely the first seven, which alone he seems to admit—bear witness to the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone.

Now the Council of Nicaea contains absolutely nothing about the Holy Spirit beyond this profession: "we believe in the Holy Spirit." Whence Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Epiphanius say

that, since questions had not yet been stirred up, the Fathers spoke only in passing about the Holy Spirit.

Nevertheless, the Photian finds confirmation of his doctrine in the Council of Nicaea. For Gelasius of Cyzicus (Hist. Conc. Nic., II), in the fifth century, reports at length a disputation held in the council by certain bishops with a pagan philosopher. There Leontius, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, demonstrates to the philosopher the divinity of the Holy Spirit, and Macarius adduces this disputation attributed to Leontius as the testimony of the council itself. But, good sir, the very historical fact of a disputation of this sort, at least as it is reported, is convicted of falsehood by the testimonies of the Fathers whom I named, who relate that no controversy had yet been raised concerning the third Person, and that therefore the Fathers of Nicaea touched upon the whole doctrine of the Holy Spirit only "in passing" (ἐν παραδρομῇ). Even if, then, the historical truth of the disputation were to stand, the statements of individual bishops would not for that reason be so many definitions of the council. Leaving aside all this, what, then, does that Gelasius bring forward? Absolutely nothing other than what Cyril had said shortly before Gelasius, in his ninth anathema; in which not only did he not deny the origin of the Spirit from the Son, but he affirmed it, so that on account of this he suffered calumny from Theodoret, who perverted his opinion into a Macedonian sense. But, just as Cyril repelled that calumny, so he asserted all the more firmly the eternal origin of the Spirit from the Son. Accordingly, in Gelasius, under the name of Leontius, this alone is said to vindicate the divinity of the Holy Spirit: "admit the one divinity of the Father, who ineffably begets the Son, and of the Son begotten from Him, and of the Holy Spirit proceeding from the same Father, who is the proper Spirit of the Son"—καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος τοῦ ἐκπορευομένου ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἰδίου δὲ ὄντος τοῦ υἱοῦ (Gelasius, II, c. 20). In the same way, to vindicate the one person of

Christ, God and man, Cyril had written that "the Holy Spirit is proper to this man who is Christ" (ἴδιον αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα), through whom He also performed the signs of God. Now we have sufficiently demonstrated in Th. XXXIII, no. II, both from the doctrine of Scripture itself and from the common interpretation of the Fathers, that the Spirit is said to be "proper," relatively, both to the Father and to the Son, as the one breathed by the Father and the Son. Notably Cyril—who uses this as the constant epithet of the Holy Spirit—declared this in many places. "The Son has the Spirit proper to Himself, who is from Him, and belongs to Him essentially" (because, namely, the procession is from Him, but immanent). Thus he himself explained, at the Council of Ephesus, his ninth anathema. He declares the same elsewhere and frequently. "Behold, when He had said that the Spirit of truth, that is, His own, would come, He says that He proceeds from the Father; for just as He is naturally the Spirit proper to the Son, existing in Him and proceeding through Him, so too He is [the Spirit] of the Father." On John, p. 910. Against the Pneumatomachi, namely, it had to be proved that the Spirit is not only proper to the Son but also to the Father; Cyril demonstrates that this being proper to the Father is shown by the fact that the Spirit is said to proceed from the Father, so that, according to Cyril's mind, it is equivalent to say in the Trinity that the Spirit is "proper" (ἴδιον) to another Person, and that the Spirit proceeds from this other Person. Therefore, just as in this passage procession is inferred to conclude that the Spirit is "proper to the Father as He is proper to the Son," so certainly, from the fact that the Spirit is proper to the Son no less than to the Father, the inference holds in turn that He proceeds just as from the Father so also from the Son. In this second way Cyril, together with the Council of Alexandria, concludes against Nestorius that of this person who is the man Jesus the Holy Spirit is said to be proper; therefore, the same Spirit proceeds from this person, the Son,

just as from the person of the Father. "When [Christ], in the performance of mighty works for the demonstration of His divinity, made use of the Holy Spirit ([48]), He said that He was glorified by Him, just as if one of us should say of the strength innate in him or of knowledge of any subject: 'this has glorified me.' For although the Spirit subsists in His own hypostasis, and to that extent is considered per se (καθ' ἑαυτό), inasmuch as He is Spirit and not the Son, nevertheless He is not alien from Him; since He is called the Spirit of truth, and Christ is the Truth, and He is poured forth from Him, just as indeed also from God and the Father."

Note: ("Πνεῦμα γὰρ ἀληθείας ὠνόμασται, καὶ ἔστι Χριστὸς ἡ ἀλήθεια· καὶ προχεῖται παρ' αὐτοῦ, καθάπερ ἀμέλει καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός. The Holy Spirit's 'being poured forth' (προχεῖσθαι) from the Son, just as from the Father, neither ever signifies nor can signify anything other than immanent procession. Hence Cyril designates by the same verb προχεῖσθαι the procession from the Father, and he has it synonymous with ἐκπορεύεσθαι: 'The Holy Spirit,' he says, 'is poured forth, that is, proceeds as from a fountain, from God and the Father' (προχεῖται ἤγουν ἐκπορεύεται, καθάπερ ἀπὸ πηγῆς, τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός), ep. 47, vol. V, p. 190. Macarius perhaps understood the force of the verb προχεῖσθαι himself; for 'to be poured forth from the Father and from the Son' is not ambiguous, unlike the verb ἐκχέεσθαι 'to be poured out,' taken by itself, which can mean, and in certain contexts truly does mean, the mission of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:17; 10:45; Tit. 3:6). But the Photian turns the phrases 'from the Son' and 'from the Father' into these others, 'through the Son' and 'through the Father,' since 'outpouring of the Holy Spirit from the Father' cannot in any way mean simply the mission. He even interprets the very verb

[48] Ἐκέχρητο τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι αὐτῷ, τῷ ἰδίῳ πνεύματι—"He was using the Holy Spirit, His own proper Spirit."

'is poured forth' not merely ambiguously of an 'effusion' but as any 'diffusion': 'L'Esprit se répand par Lui comme aussi par le Père.' From his words—not, however, from those of the Council of Alexandria and of Cyril, as he imagines—he easily cobbles together the argument: 'L'expression se répand par le Fils n'a point du tout le même sens que, procéde du Fils.' Then he compares Paul's words (Tit. 3) 'quem effudit (ἐξέχεεν) in nos abunde,' and from this concludes: 'par conséquent dans la lettre citée du Concile on employa pour indiquer l'effusion du S. E. par le Fils presque le même verbe προχέω que l'Apôtre ἐκχέω, savoir un verbe ayant la même racine' (Macarius, p. 361). By such philological 'learning,' piety and impiety would become almost the same word; for they have the same root. The verbs προχεῖσθαι and ἐκχεῖσθαι are different, and much more different is the context. In the latter, the terminus ad extra is expressly indicated: 'God poured out upon us the Holy Spirit'; in the former, the principle of origin is expressed, but no terminus ad quem: 'the Holy Spirit is poured forth from the Son just as from the Father.' Furthermore, the Fathers of the Council say that the Spirit of truth is poured forth from the Truth—that is, from the Son—just as power or knowledge arises from the mind. Therefore, just as the Word is the wisdom and power of the Father by reason of origin from the Father, so the Spirit —no less by reason of immanent origin—is called the power and wisdom of the Son; and hence, by an internal origin, He is poured forth from the Son just as from the Father.

The Photian also mutters something about the diversity of the prepositions 'from the Father' and 'from the Son'—ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός, παρὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ. The authors of the letter, he says, set a difference between the Father and the Son: 'L'Esprit, disent-ils, se répand par (παρά) le Fils, comme venant aussi de (ἐκ) Dieu le Père.' But the authors of the letter use not different verbs but absolutely one and the same for the relation of the Spirit to the Father and to the

Son; nor do they say that the Spirit is 'diffused through' the Son, but that He is 'poured forth from' the Son just as 'from' the Father. Moreover, the prepositions ἐκ and παρά are entirely synonymous when they are used regarding the relation of the Holy Spirit to the other Persons of the Trinity: 'He proceeds from the Father'—παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται (John 15:26); 'the Spirit is from God'—τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Cor 2:12). Indeed Epiphanius (Haer. 74, no. 10, p. 898) inverts the prepositions: 'the Spirit who is from the Father, who is from the Son'—τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ... ὁ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὁ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ. I would not, however, contend if someone should persuade himself that, in the conjunction of both particles—'from the Father, from the Son'—Cyril has already indicated the Father as the primordial principle (αἰτία προκαταρκτική) of the Holy Spirit, as the preposition ἐκ in the seventh and eighth centuries was understood by some, and as many Fathers expressed even more clearly by another formula, by which they said that the Spirit proceeds 'from the Father' or 'from the Father through the Son.' See Th. XXXVI.")

Let it stand, therefore, that nothing at all is taught by the Council of Nicaea itself about the procession of the Spirit except that He is the third Person of the Trinity; but that in the Gelasian disputation, to which Macarius appeals, not only is the procession not denied; it is affirmed by a formula taken from Scripture and lucidly declared by other Fathers—that the Holy Spirit proceeds just as from the Father so also from the Son.

From the Council of Constantinople the Russian theologian, together with all the Photians, repeats the definition inserted in the creed against the Macedonians, about which we spoke in Th. XXXVIII.

From the Council of Ephesus nothing else is adduced except that, in the condemnation of the falsified creed, it was forbidden to bring forward, write, or compose any faith other than that defined by

the holy Fathers who, with the Holy Spirit, were assembled at Nicaea. In Councils IV, V, and VI the same law is repeated. What is to be thought about these things we have demonstrated in Th. XLI, and we shall say a little below. Even if, moreover, they affix to these councils a contradictory and absurd sense—as though the Church had renounced her very right and duty divinely enjoined, namely to explain the deposit of faith and, should the need arise, to define and vindicate more strictly, even in solemn creeds, the errors that arise—how, I ask, from this prohibition will they derive the doctrine which Macarius undertook to prove, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone and not also from the Son, when this Photian tenet is contained neither in the Nicene nor in the Constantinopolitan creed, the integrity of which, against the frauds of heretics, that law was promulgated by the councils to preserve?

From the Seventh Council, and from the Roman Councils under Damasus and under Martin I, nothing else is had except what has always been and is and will be the common Catholic profession, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father; but there is no trace whatsoever of Macarius' assertion that in these councils the procession of the same Spirit from the Father alone is taught and that procession from the Father inasmuch as He is one with the Son is denied. The former—what long ago had to be proved directly against the Arian Pneumatomachi—is certainly demonstrated by the countless testimonies of Scripture, creeds, councils, and the holy Fathers; for the latter, which alone is the point at issue with the Photians, neither Macarius nor anyone else will ever find any authentic document.

The schismatic theologian, moreover, is to be reproved because, in the Seventh Council, he mentions only the profession of Theodore of Jerusalem, in which it is said that the Spirit eternally proceeds from the Father, while he suppresses in silence the other

profession, that of St. Tarasius of Constantinople ([49]). Tarasius had sent his synodical letter to the Eastern patriarchs—of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem—in which he explicitly professed: "I believe in one God ... and in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and giver of life, proceeding from the Father through the Son, and that He is God and is known to be such" ([50]) (Mansi XII, p. 1121). This whole profession of Tarasius, read in the council, received approval from the other Fathers and, before all, from the legates of Hadrian, the Roman Pontiff, because it was found to agree with the faith of the Pontiff himself. "Peter (archpriest) and Peter (abbot of St. Sabbas), God-beloved priests and representatives of our most holy Pope Hadrian Senior of Rome, said: 'We acquiesce, because, according to the faith which Tarasius, the most holy and most blessed Patriarch of Constantinople, has rightly confessed, our Apostolic Pope Hadrian, together with the venerable holy synod which is with him, receives and agrees.'"

---

[49] "That Macarius fraudulently suppressed the profession of Tarasius you will easily see if you look at the connection, in the acts of the Council, of Theodore's synodical letter with that of Tarasius. First, Tarasius' profession to the Easterners was read; then the Easterners' response, into which Theodore's synodical letter had been inserted; and then finally there followed the approbation of both professions, read in a single context. Moreover, from that response of the Easterners, to which Macarius appeals, he himself could have learned many things—and, among others, above all this—that for the constitution of an ecumenical synod there is by no means need of the presence of the Eastern patriarchs and bishops, either in person or through their legates, provided that the Apostolic Pope of Rome has agreed and is present in it through his apocrisiaries, he who presides over the see of the Prince of the Apostles (Mansi XII, p. 11334)."

[50] Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸν κύριον, καὶ ζωοποιοῦν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς δι' υἱοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ αὐτὸ θεὸν ὄν τε καὶ γνωριζόμενον.

How Hadrian understood and admitted Tarasius' faith concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Father through the Son," he himself shortly afterward declared in a letter to Charlemagne. Charlemagne, in Theodore's letter, did indeed criticize certain points, but by no means that he said the Spirit proceeds from the Father; for he easily saw (as is declared in the Libri Carolini, III, c. 3) that the Father, in unity with the Son, is named the principle of the Spirit. But he doubted the orthodoxy of Tarasius, "who in the reading of his confession professes that the Holy Spirit proceeds not from the Father and the Son, according to the faith of the Nicene creed (51), but 'from the Father through the Son.'" Now Hadrian, piling up

51 "According to the genuine understanding of the creed, as it has always been believed by common consent; and for at least three centuries in Spain, and thereafter in the whole realm of Charlemagne, the very Constantinopolitan formula had been explicitly declared."

testimonies of the Fathers, demonstrates to Charlemagne ([52]) that the phrases "from the Father through the Son" exhibit no less than the other formula "from the Father and the Son" two distinct persons as one principle. And so Tarasius did not explain this dogma of himself, but confessed it according to the doctrine of the holy Fathers (Mansi XIII, p. 760).

Although, therefore, the Seventh Council was not directly treating the procession of the Holy Spirit, there is, nonetheless, a manifest consensus of East and West both concerning the dogma itself of procession from the Father through the Son (or from the Father and the Son) and concerning the genuine sense of the Constantinopolitan creed.

---

[52] "The testimonies which Hadrian uses might seem to someone somewhat ineffective for proving the procession of the Holy Spirit; but it must be noted that Charlemagne suspected that formula because, in the preposition 'through,' he thought the Arian error lurked concerning the Spirit created through the Son (Libri Carolini, III, c. 3). Hence the Pontiff undertakes to demonstrate, first, that the particle 'through' is used by the holy Fathers not only with respect to creation but also with respect to the relation of the Son to the Holy Spirit; second, that among those same Fathers the grammatical construction 'from the Father through the Son' is used promiscuously and is of the same signification as the other, 'from the Father and the Son.' For both of these, the testimonies brought forward by Hadrian are entirely sufficient, although not in all of them is the procession of the Holy Spirit treated immediately. Furthermore, once these two points are proved, it follows that the formula more frequent among Western Fathers, 'the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son'—which the Pontiff certainly holds as a valid expression of the Catholic faith—is altogether equivalent to the other formula of the Easterners, 'the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son,' about whose value Charlemagne had conceived a suspicion (see Th. XXXVI)."

Finally, there is another fraud in this paragraph of Macarius' diatribe: that, among those who are said to have asserted simply that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, he numbers without any remark the African Fathers in the profession of faith presented to King Huneric; although, after the edition of Victor of Vita prepared by Ruinart, he could not—or certainly ought not—have been ignorant that, in the genuine reading of that noble profession by those 461 holy confessors, it is expressly declared: "We believe the unbegotten Father, and the Son begotten of the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son, to be of one substance or essence." (Victor Vitensis, III, no. 1). But on this matter what I have said in Th. XXXV is sufficient.

§ II.
On the Councils of Toledo & of Aachen

Macarian erudition now advances to obscure a most learned profession of the Councils of Toledo and of Aachen, which were celebrated from the fifth to the ninth century, before the rise of the Photian heresy; for it is silent about the synods of Hatfield under Theodore of Canterbury (a Greek by nation) in the year 680 (Mansi XI, p. 176) and of Worms in the year 868 (Mansi XV, p. 868; cf. in Migne T. CXIX, p. 1201), (53) as likewise about the ecumenical Councils of Lateran IV, Lyons II, and Florence.

1º Concerning the Toledan synods, we have said as much as is needed in Thesis XXXV, no. II. Against them Macarius has ready to hand three refrains, everywhere familiar to him, by which you could

53 It is clear from that response of Worms against the heresy of the Greeks (in Migne, loc. cit.) that, at the urging of Pope Nicholas, the Council was held against the calumnies of Photius; hence there must be corrected what I said in the Treatise, ed. 2, p. 467, note 1.

easily overthrow among the unlearned populace all trust in Scripture and in the monuments of history, both sacred and profane.

a) "The acts of the Councils," he says, "are suspect, and the word Filioque was perhaps added later by interpolation; proof of this fraud exists in these very Councils in which the procession of the Spirit from the Son is denied, when it is said that the Father is the source and origin of the whole divinity, from whom the Son received his birth and the Holy Spirit his procession." But if this argument holds, then not only the word Filioque in those synods, but also the letter of Pope Leo which the definition of the Second Council of Toledo (A.D. 447) follows, and the whole history of the Third Council under Reccared, and all Catholic documents—not only of the ancient Fathers but even the more recent ones from the ninth century down to the nineteenth—would have to be called interpolated. For all Catholics profess with the holy Fathers a truth most certain from the economy of the mystery: that the Father is the first Person and therefore the source and origin of the Son and the Holy Spirit, the second and the third Persons. From whom the Son has that he is God—for he is God from God—and from whom he assuredly has that the Holy Spirit proceeds also from him; and through this the Holy Spirit proceeds also from the Son, just as he proceeds from the Father, "from whom he (the Son) has it," says Augustine, "that the Holy Spirit proceeds from him (the Son)." Aug., In Io. tract. 99, n. 8; Contra Maximin. l. II, c. 5.

b) The Photians reply: even if the acts of the Councils are genuine, it is not clear whether in them the subject is the eternal procession, or rather the temporal mission of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. Yet in those Councils the mutual relations of the divine Persons and their proper personal characteristics are described; and just as it is proper to the Father to be unbegotten, and proper to the Son to be begotten, so it is said to be proper to the Holy Spirit to

proceed from the Father and the Son, such that the same procession from the Father, which is the notional property of the Holy Spirit, is the procession from the Father and the Son together. But this procession, which constitutes and distinguishes the third Person, is assuredly immanent and eternal. Therefore the Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten, the Paraclete not begotten but proceeding from the Father and the Son (Council of Toledo II). Furthermore, in the Council of Toledo III the profession "who proceeds from the Father and the Son" is inserted into the very Constantinopolitan Creed. Now all the Photians—and Macarius himself—admit and insist that in this Creed the faith is expressed not only about the temporal, but about the eternal procession. See also the Creed of the Eleventh Council of Toledo (A.D. 675), celebrated two full centuries before the Photian heresy.

c) Macarius's last refuge remains that the Spanish Councils fell into error: "Nor are these not inconsiderable Spanish Councils," he says, "of any weight against the doctrine of the whole Church." Yet this profession of the Spanish Councils is nothing other than a repeated statement of the faith of the whole Church, as we have abundantly demonstrated in the Theses of our Treatise; against which the contradiction introduced by Photius through ambition, hardened into a sect from the eleventh century onward, fostered and sustained down to this age—on the one hand by the growth of barbarism and savage persecutions, on the other by an ignorance matching its pride and by the abject servitude of the clergy—has not only no weight at all, but is a most manifest heresy.

2º Concerning the Council of Aachen the Photian introduces new fabrications onto the stage. "It is shown," he says, "by the history of this Council that the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son was not recognized in the Western Church before the ninth century, and that this doctrine was treated as an innovation."

a) For, given a question stirred up by a monk of Jerusalem, there would have been no need of a Council, if the procession from the Father and the Son had already been settled in the Western Church.

b) From the historians of that time it is gathered that "at Aachen the matter was hotly debated on both sides; and since neither side yielded to the other, by that very fact nothing was concluded." In support of this narrative he appeals to the Annals of the Franks, in which we read: "Nevertheless nothing was defined, because of the magnitude of the matters, as it seemed"; and the same is gathered from the words of Hermannus Contractus: "The question concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit is aired by a synod."

c) In a letter sent by Charlemagne to Pope Leo III after the Council was concluded, this question is said to have "arisen recently" and to have been "left undecided for a long time" (54).

d) The emperor's legates, in the presence of the Pope, tried to persuade this doctrine from texts of Scripture explained preposterously and from interpolated testimonies of the Fathers. The Pope, pretending to be convinced, decreed that it was to be believed thus (55)—and that not by all the faithful, but only by those who could reach an understanding of so great a mystery.

e) Finally, the Pope himself confessed that the holy Fathers who forbade this profession to be inserted into the Creed, or anything in it to be changed, could not be said—illumined by divine wisdom—"to have understood this less than we." Macarius insinuates to his followers—whom he knows full well will never read the Pope's

---

54 "Question demeurée depuis long temps indécise chez les investigateurs de la vérité." Macar., p. 365.

55 "Le Pape feignit d'être convaincu que le S. Esprit procède aussi du Fils; et ordonna que l'on crût ainsi." p. 365.

actual words in their context—that, in Leo's opinion, the holy Fathers denied the procession from the Son, and nonetheless understood the dogma better than those who admit it; and therefore that Leo himself forbade this to be added to the Creed. (56)

From all this he draws the following conclusion. If the dogma had been believed from antiquity, there would have been no need for the Aachener legates to prove it before the Pope from Scripture and the Fathers; there would have been no need for the Pope to define that it must henceforth be believed. The Pope was deceived by a false allegation of texts, and his assent depended on these allegations: "Thus I hold with these authorities and with the authorities of sacred Scripture." Finally, since the Pope responded to Charlemagne's legates, among other things: "Whoever can reach to this more subtle understanding, and either refuses to know it or, knowing it, refuses to believe it, cannot be saved"; and further: "It is not permitted not to believe, whoever is able to reach to this," our Photian exclaims: "What kind of dogma, pray, is this of a new sort, which not everyone is bound to admit?" (57)

---

56 "Dogme de nouvelle espèce que tout le monde n'est point obligé d'admettre!" p. 366.

57 "Ioannes, who was from the monastery of S. Sabas... rose up against us, saying that the Franks who are on the Mount of Olives are heretics; and he said to us: 'You are all heretics, you Franks'; and he reproves our faith, 'for there is no greater heresy'... And he so disturbed us that on the day of the Nativity of the Lord (in the year 808) at holy Bethlehem, in the holy manger... he sent laymen who wished to cast us out, saying, 'You are heretics, and the books you have are heretical'... And thus through this John a great confusion was caused us in the holy city, because he says: 'The Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father and the Son.' And about this he sent a great error through all the monasteries." Letter of the monks to Leo III (Lequien, Dissert. Damascen. I, no. 13).

For my part, I would not care to determine in this whole declamation whether crass ignorance of history—both of events and of dogmas—or rather the Greek fraud of an impostor prevails. A straightforward inspection of the history will suffice to demolish the whole Macarian edifice.

A Greek monk, John—whom we recalled in Theses XXXIX and XLI—accused all the Latins at Jerusalem "of heresy than which there is no greater," because they professed in the Creed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. The Latin monks who, on the Mount of Olives, by concession of the Caliph Aaron the Illustrious (Harun al-Rashid) were placed under the protection of Charlemagne, were accustomed to recite the Creed with the explanatory Filioque, as they had heard it sung in the kingdoms of Charles. Against these, therefore, that John roused serious tumults with his outcries, by which the Latins were thrown into great dangers (58). Wherefore they, as they themselves recount in their letter, first fled for refuge "to the priests who are in the holy city," namely to the Greek patriarch and his clergy. When they protested: "We believe as the holy Apostolic Roman See," the Greeks wrote for them a charter of faith, that is, a testimony of orthodox faith, and "the archdeacon read that charter among the people" (see Thesis XXXIX). After this the Latin monks sent legates (59) with letters of commendation from the patriarch Thomas—which Pope Leo mentions in his own letter to Emperor Charles—to the Pope himself, asking that he vindicate their profession and set forth the faith of the Church with regard to this article attacked by that John. To forestall the spread of the error, the

---

58 If the letter of the monks to Leo and Leo's letter to the Emperor are compared, these legates, sent from Jerusalem to Rome, seem to have been Agamus and Roculphus with the presbyter John.

59 The letter of Leo to the Emperor is found in Lequien, loc. cit.

Pope immediately wrote out the symbol of orthodox faith to all the Eastern Churches, "that both you," he says, "and the whole world may hold, according to the right and inviolable faith of the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church." This symbol, sent to all the Eastern Churches and expressing the inviolable faith of the Roman Church which is to be held by the whole world, reads thus: "We believe the holy Trinity, that is, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, one omnipotent God, of one substance... the Father in himself, not from another; the Son begotten of the Father... the Holy Spirit proceeding equally from the Father and the Son, consubstantial moreover with the Father and the Son. The Father is fully God in himself, the Son is fully God begotten of the Father, the Holy Spirit is fully God proceeding from the Father and the Son." (Lequien, loc. cit., no. 14).

With this declaration of faith in hand, Leo sent the legates of the monks of the Mount of Olives to Emperor Charles as well, that they might seek his protection also. When Charles had been informed about the tumults stirred up against this article of faith—in which the Franks were already by the Council of Gentilly in the year 767 under his father Pippin, and by the Second Council of Nicaea (though with regard to this latter assuredly without good reason), held suspect by the Greeks—and when he had received so explicit an exposition of the faith from the Roman Pontiff, in the year 809 he took care to have the Council of Aachen celebrated, about which Macarius dreams up so many things.

Note: "In the Carolingian Books, of which at least the principal eighty-five chapters Charles probably sent in 794 through Angilbert to Pope Hadrian I for correction, there is also contained a censure of that expression which the Greeks use—'that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son'—as ambiguous and not sufficiently consonant with the universal faith, by which the procession from the Father and the Son is believed. Tarasius (in the

Second Council of Nicaea) confessed in his profession of faith that the Holy Spirit proceeds not 'from the Father alone,' like some—who, although they kept silent in a certain way that he proceeds from the Son, nonetheless altogether believed that he proceeds from the Father and the Son—nor 'from the Father and the Son,' as the whole Church universally confesses and believes that he proceeds, but 'from the Father through the Son.' In which profession, unless there is the purity and sincerity of heart which believes him not a creature but the Creator, and not less than the Father and the Son but equal to them and consubstantial and proceeding from both, a pernicious poison could arise... If the definition of other matters must be so clear and lucid that those things which are to be shown are shown evidently, much more must the definition of faith be lucid and clear and free from all ambiguity or tortuosity... For it is rightly believed and commonly confessed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, not from the Father through the Son; for he proceeds not through the Son as through a creature 'by whom all things were made,' nor as if later in time or lesser in power or of another substance, but he is believed to proceed from the Father and the Son as coeternal, consubstantial, coequal, existing with them in one glory, power, and divinity... And therefore it can be asked whether it may be said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, lest, when this proposition is incautiously put forward in the profession of so great a mystery, it supply a cup to anyone of that Arian error, which blasphemes that the Holy Spirit is a creature and was created through the Son just as other things which have been created." Carolin. l. III, c. 3. Indeed, there at c. 8 suspicion is cast upon all the Greek bishops who had taken part in the Council: "Whereby the faith of almost all is doubted, since some confessed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father only, and some neither from the Father nor from the Son." Hadrian, in his response to

Charles, vindicated the orthodoxy of the Greeks even with regard to this article, as we have seen elsewhere. Cf. supra p. 79; and Thesis XXXIX, p. 574. On the Carolingian Books see the illustrious Hefele, Hist. Concil., T. III, § 399 seq.

Three matters were treated in the Council: the doctrine itself of the procession from the Father and the Son; the insertion of this profession into the Constantinopolitan Creed; and the state of the Churches. With respect to the first, the doctrine and the Catholic faith were certainly established, since in the realms of the Franks for a long time the public profession had been solemnly promulgated in the liturgy, and the Pope himself, in his own symbol addressed to all the Eastern Churches—which lay to hand—had declared that the same truth was to be held inviolably by all. Nevertheless, since an error against the dogma seemed now to be emerging among the Greeks, it seemed good to search out in Scripture and the Fathers the foundations of the ancient faith and to fortify the truth from those same sources. Thus it has always been done in all the Councils with regard to truths long believed but needing a new declaration against heretics; by this method the ancient faith concerning the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, then concerning the unity of Person and the two unconfused natures, and the two operations and wills in Christ, and concerning the relative veneration of images, was defined—as is clear from the history and acts of the first seven Councils. This vindication of Catholic doctrine at the Council of Aachen, in Charles's intention, chiefly tended to this: that he might obtain from Pope Leo not now a definition of the dogma already proclaimed by Leo himself in his declaration to the Easterners, but the insertion of the same profession into the Creed. That the proceedings in the Council were thus conducted we learn not so much from the few words of the annals of that age as from those matters which, after the Council, were explained before the

same Pope by the legates of Charles, Bishop Bernhar of Worms and Abbot Adalhard of Corbie, who had been sent to Leo III.

First, the testimonies "were read in order"—which are thought to be those published by Holstenius under the fictitious (as it seems) title of a letter of Emperor Charles to Leo III (Mansi XIV, p. 23). They were not read to persuade the Pope of the doctrine, as Macarius foolishly says—since the Pope himself had sent to the Emperor the profession already so often mentioned—but the testimonies were recited by way of introduction and preparation for the principal aim of the imperial legation, namely that, as we said, the solemn sanction of insertion into the Creed might be obtained from the Pope. Hence in the beginning of that collection of testimonies the author laments that the article concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit had long since ceased to be inculcated with such pressing proclamation as in the time of the holy Fathers; "but now, when the contrary error has emerged, Almighty God has willed to rouse the hearts of pastors to this same question (which lay for a long time undiscussed)... lest the cockle of the sower of iniquity and the evil seed be able to choke the fair fruit of the wheat, or a bird flying everywhere—the heretical one—snatch away from hearts the Catholic seed of the little ones." Then follow the testimonies of

Scripture and of the Fathers ([60]), "that, conquered by the testimonies of the divine books and pressed by a cloud of many orthodox witnesses, the adversary may not be able to resist the truth, but rather, persuaded by the Catholic judgments and truthful testimonies, may return to the safest bosom of the Church." When these had been read through, there followed immediately the discussion with the Pope, in which nothing was treated concerning the dogma itself—except that the full assent to it, already previously manifest, should again be declared by Leo as a truth of the Catholic faith to be explicitly believed by all, yet in such a way that for those excused by inculpable ignorance implicit faith would suffice, as happens in all dogmas whose

[60] "Whoever," said the Pope, "can reach to this more subtle understanding, and either refuses to know it or, knowing it, refuses to believe it, cannot be saved. For there are many things—of which this is one—higher mysteries of the holy faith and more subtle sacraments, to the investigation of which many are able to attain; but many, impeded either by the smallness of age or by the quality of understanding, are not able. And therefore, as we have said, he who could and would not [believe] cannot be saved." Mansi XIV, p. 19. These the Macarian calls dogmas "of a new kind," whose knowledge and explicit faith are not necessary for salvation for all. Perhaps not even the Russians would wish truths of faith to be enclosed in an ambit so narrow that nothing is considered to pertain to the deposit of faith which children, peasants—indeed I would add—their own Popes and bishops do not know.

knowledge is not of the necessity of means ([61]). The legates, however —on account of the superior importance of this article and of the necessity of precept, that all might be more readily instructed in this truth—tried to obtain the one thing for the sake of which they had been sent: that the insertion into the Creed be confirmed by the Pope's authority ([62]). How this was then refused by Leo III, but was later, because of the necessity arising from the Photian heresy, gradually introduced by legitimate usage, we have said in Thesis XLI.

---

[61] From the sequence of events described it is clear what is to be thought of that controversy whether in the synod of Aachen there was treated only of the declaration to be inserted into the Creed—as Baronius holds (ad ann. 809, n. 53)—or of the doctrine itself of the procession only, as, against Baronius, Pagi (in Critica there) contends from Cointius. Most certainly, just as the Greek monk had raised the question about both, so in the Council both were treated—but in the different manner we have shown; and the writers of the annals are to be understood as referring to both when they say that the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit was agitated; but it can be understood only of that which Charles and the synod itself chiefly urged—that is, of insertion into the Creed—when Eginhard (Annals ad h. a.) says that "for defining this, Bernhar and Adalhard were sent to Rome to Pope Leo"; for concerning the doctrine itself not only had it long since been fully settled, but the most recent definition of Leo, sent to the Emperor and through him transmitted to the Council, lay before their eyes.

[62] "A great synod is gathered at Aachen in the year of the Lord's Incarnation 809, in which synod the question is treated concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit. This question the monk John of Jerusalem had raised" (Macarius cites thus far, but carefully suppresses what follows), "whereas the rule and ecclesiastical faith affirm that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, not created, not begotten, but coeternal and consubstantial with the Father and the Son." Ado, Chronicle, at the year 809.

Now from the very history of the events no one can be in doubt that not only in the Council of Aachen but in the whole Church—especially the Western Church, about which Macarius argues in this chapter—there was full agreement in the dogma itself of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son; nor is there now any need to refute at length, one by one, the fictions which the Photian invents about the Council as we have described them above.

a) The tumults stirred up by the monk John and the danger lest the error spread more widely were sufficiently grave that both Pope Leo, in his symbol to all the Churches, and the Council of Aachen under the Pope's guidance should undertake a vindication of Catholic doctrine. In favor of calling a Council there was the further reason of the suspicion—though without just cause—under which, in Charles's mind, the faith of the Greeks generally labored.

b) From the history of the dogma of the procession of the Holy Spirit in the Church, especially in the West, and even more plainly in the realms of Charlemagne, not only is Macarius's conclusion not drawn—that at Aachen it was keenly debated on both sides—but it is most manifest that among those to whom even ambiguous expressions about this dogma seemed intolerable, who openly acknowledged the full consensus of the whole Church, who daily professed the article of faith in the very Creed, there was no debate and could be none, except to vindicate and confirm the dogma "as the whole Church universally confesses and believes." In these circumstances Macarius absurdly imagines that in the Council itself there were differing opinions about the doctrine, because Ado of Vienne, Hermannus Contractus, and other writers of annals say that "the question concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit was ventilated or agitated" in the Council. What all those writers report is this: that the question whether the Holy Spirit also proceeds from the

Son was raised by the Greek monk John, and that, concerning this question thus raised, the synod of Aachen dealt with it. In what sense it dealt with it is shown by the events we have set forth; and, moreover, Ado—whose words Macarius cites truncated—indicates the same openly (63). As for the assertion that it was "hotly debated" and "nothing decided," Macarius invents it. For those words which he himself cites (from Aimoinus, De Gestis Franc., IV, c. 97) do not refer

63 Aimoinus of Fleury (whom Macarius calls Aimon) wrote his history of the Deeds of the Franks at the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century; it ends at IV, c. 42. All the remaining parts of Book IV and Book V are added by others (see Migne, Patrologia, T. CXXXIX). In this appendix the words to which the adversary appeals are copied from Eginhard's Annals at the year 809: "The emperor, returning from the Ardennes to Aachen in the month of November, held a Council about the procession of the Holy Spirit—a question which a certain monk John had first moved at Jerusalem—'for the defining of which' Bishop Bernhar of Worms and Abbot Adalhard of the monastery of Corbie were sent to Rome to Pope Leo. There was also debated in the same Council the state of the Churches and the manner of life of those who are said to serve God in them; 'but nothing was defined' because of the magnitude of the matters, as it seemed." (On Aimoinus's History see the dissertation of Philippe Labbé.)

to the dogma of the procession of the Holy Spirit, but to something quite different—namely to ecclesiastical discipline (64).

c) As for the third point, the question against the dogma was indeed "recently raised," and it was the monk John who first stirred it up. Therefore, so long as the truth was simply believed without controversy, in that state of peaceful possession a more diligent inquiry and a more pressing proclamation did not seem necessary—just as Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, and Epiphanius say of the Fathers of the Council of Nicaea that their doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit was set forth only "by the way" (ἐν παραδρομῇ, ἐλλιπῶς), because the question had not yet been raised at that time; but the opinion was implanted without snares in the minds of the faithful (see Thesis XXXV). In this dogma, in general, there occurred what holds everywhere in the unfolding of revealed doctrine: "Many things which pertain to the Catholic faith, when they are vexed by the crafty restlessness of heretics, so that they may be defended against them, are both considered more carefully and understood more clearly and proclaimed more insistently; and when the adversary raises the

64 "Legates: This I ask; this I beg to be said: because it is good to believe it—good today both for believing and, as it would have been then, for singing—if it had been inserted by them (the ancient Fathers). Pope: It is certainly good and very good, inasmuch as it is a sacrament so great of the faith, which it is not permitted not to believe, whoever is able to reach to this. Legates: Would not the same authors have done well then, if by adding only four syllables so very necessary a sacrament of faith were made clear for all the ages to come? Pope: Just as I do not dare to say that they would not have done well if they had done it—because, without doubt, as for other (dogmas of faith no less necessary) which they omitted, they acted knowingly and illuminated not so much by human as by divine wisdom—so also I do not dare to say that they understood this less than we." Mansi XIV, p. 19.

question, an occasion for learning arises," Augustine, Civ. Dei XVI, c. 2, n. 1; In Ps. 54, n. 22; cf. Vincent of Lérins, Commonit. nn. 27–32 (see Treatise on Tradition, Theses XXIII, XXV). This very thing—if not in so many words, certainly in sense—warns the author of that writing which we have under the name of a letter of Charlemagne to Pope Leo. Nor, indeed, does he say—as Macarius does—that the question was "left undecided"; but perhaps he laments, not without some exaggeration, that for a long time it had been less diligently discussed: "long neglected; long lying undiscussed"; but now "Almighty God willed to rouse the hearts of pastors" to consider it more carefully, to understand it more clearly, and to proclaim it more insistently, "lest the cockle of the sower of iniquity and the evil seed be able to choke the fair fruit of the wheat, or a bird flying everywhere —the heretical one—snatch away from hearts the Catholic seed of the little ones." Thus, he says, "by the providence of God the present Church is beaten by the frequent blows of questions, that, taught by Catholic doctrines and refined by the confessions of sound faith, she may be able to live forever and to reign happily with the Lord."

d) What is adduced in the fourth place is nothing but a hotchpotch of shameless falsehoods, as is clear from what we have already laid down. For how, I ask, was that Catholic doctrine to be first proposed by the Frankish legates, then to be persuaded from the adduced testimonies, and finally feignedly admitted by the Pope—when the very definition of the Pope, according to the right and inviolable faith of the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church to be held by the whole world, he himself had just sent to Emperor Charles, and indeed this very profession and definition of the Pope had been proposed to the Council from which those legates had been sent? As for the distinction between articles whose explicit belief is of the necessity of means, or of the necessity of precept, or which are not for all the faithful of the necessity either of means or of precept—so that

implicit faith suffices—there is no need to say more. Let Macarius the theologian, a bishop and now a metropolitan among his own, learn these things from a catechism (see Treatise on Tradition, Thesis XXIII).

e) There remains what Macarius imputes to the Pope concerning the mind of the Fathers. He insinuates, namely, that Leo's words—"the holy Fathers did not understand this less than we, and nonetheless did not place the profession of procession from the Son in the Creed"—are referred to the dogma itself, as though Leo had said that the Fathers, illumined by divine wisdom, understood the mystery of the Trinity, yet did not admit the procession of the Spirit from the Son. But the discussion there is far different. The Pope and the Frankish legates are in full agreement as to the certitude of the dogma; from this very point the legates ask whether the ancient Fathers would not deserve to be praised if they had inserted into the Creed this truth of faith so certain and so necessary. To this question the Pope replies, in words cited by Macarius truncated and out of context, that he does not dare to say the Fathers would not have done well, if they had added an explanation to the Creed; but neither can the form of the Creed fixed by the Fathers be blamed, since those men —illumined not less than we by divine wisdom—understood what truths of the faith it was fitting to include in the Creed and what to omit (15). This matter pertains to discipline; from an ancient and universal discipline one ought not to depart without a graver cause—and in the time of Leo, before the Photian heresy had been introduced and solidified, no such cause was apparent (see Thesis XLI).

These Macarian fictions seemed to require a somewhat more distinct exposition, from which the mind might be recognized of men who, even in the clearest light, seek darkness with such effort, that in

twisting the truth they seem scarcely ever to have been surpassed by other heretics.

CHAPTER III.

ON THE TESTIMONIES OF THE HOLY FATHERS WHO TAUGHT THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT PROCEEDS FROM THE FATHER ALONE

Macarius bids his readers believe that there stand forth innumerable testimonies of the Fathers by which the Photius-inspired dogma is placed beyond all doubt ([65]). He says that Zoernikav brought forward from fifty-seven Eastern Fathers and forty-five Western Fathers nearly a thousand statements to demonstrate the truth—namely, to refute the heresy introduced by his Photius—and yet that Zoernikav did not see all the Fathers, since the works of many had not yet been brought to light in his age. Let us, then, at last expect from Macarius's learning the testimonies of the Fathers, not those most familiar ones affirming the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father, which, as we know and confess, are most abundantly attested in Scripture, in the creeds, in the councils, in the writings of all the Fathers, and in the profession of the whole Catholic Church, and which have always been diligently inculcated against the Arians and Pneumatomachi; rather, we ask for testimonies—not indeed by the thousand, as he boasts, but at least some—that contain the

[65] He entitles his diatribe thus: "Comment envisager les témoignages de cet ordre portant que le Saint-Esprit procéde du Père seul? Ces témoignages sont infiniment nombreux et variés, et, embrassant de tous les côtés la verité qu'ils confirment, ils la mettent hors de toute espèce de doute." p. 367.

Photian negation, that the Spirit does not proceed also from the Son. Moreover, the procession from the Son is to be understood, not in those alien meanings which the schismatics by calumny have foisted upon Catholic doctrine, but in its genuine sense according to the Catholic faith, by which the Son, like all things that are the Father's (except paternity), is believed to have received from the Father the spirative power; and thus the Father is indeed the principle of the Holy Spirit "without principle," or (as the holy doctors say) the primordial principle, but the Son, just as He is "God from God" and one God with the Father, so also in relation to the third Person is a principle "from a principle" and, together with the Father, one principle.

§ I.
On the Doctrine, in General, of the Fathers Who are Brought Forward

If you run through all those very texts of the Fathers which Macarius adduces—torn from their contexts—to demonstrate the Photian opinion, you will find absolutely nothing in them other than the Catholic dogma: that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and that the Father is the principle of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. But none of them teaches that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, in such wise that spiration is not common to Father and Son. For this negation—which Macarius aims to prove—those Fathers are cited; yet those very writers whom he quotes, either in express words, or even more clearly by expounding the relation of the spirated Person to the Father and the Son, or to the Father through the Son, profess the revealed faith concerning the procession of the third Person from the first and the second.

Indeed, what happens in some other dogmas—when the Fathers, before controversy had arisen and before doctrine had been more distinctly declared, spoke more obscurely and implicatively, and some, conceiving the matter less correctly, perhaps even erred—occurs in the present dogma hardly at all, or certainly far less than in certain other heads of doctrine. For among the otherwise orthodox Fathers there is found none who can be shown to have erred in the very doctrine of procession from the Son—something that, before its explicit definition and polemical declaration, would be pardonable. Concerning the opinion of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret —whose writings are heretical elsewhere and were condemned in the Third and Fifth Councils—and perhaps also of the deacon Rusticus, a schismatic, and of Anastasius the Librarian, who was joined in friendship to Photius, the architect of the heresy, doubt can indeed be entertained; but what should be judged of these very figures, once the contexts are considered and the common and clear doctrine of the other ancients is weighed at the same time, I have said in Treatise Thesis XXXV and XXXVIII. Some obscurity of expression—if words be torn from their contexts and from the doctrine clearly expressed elsewhere—can be found only in John of Damascus and, to some extent, in St. Maximus; and this ultimately comes to the single point that both used the name of "cause" (αἰτία)—and the Damascene also the preposition ἐξ in comparison with διά—in a somewhat stricter sense for the primordial cause alone, quite rightly, as Basil (De Spir. S. n. 21) and Chrysostom (In Io. hom. 5 [alt. 4] nn. 2–3) have explained, namely that the expressions "from the Father through the Son" are employed to designate the primordial cause (τὴν προκαταρκτικὴν αἰτίαν, τὸ ἀγέννητον); and Gregory of Nazianzus (Or. 34 [alt. 24] n. 8) distinguished the three Persons as "cause," "producer," and "perfecter" (τὸ αἴτιον, τὸ δημιουργὸν καὶ τὸ τελειοποιόν); and Gregory of Nyssa (contr. Eunom. I, p. 416, Migne),

regarding the very procession of the Holy Spirit, said that the Father is the prototypal light, the Son is the light that proceeds immediately from the prototypal light, and the Holy Spirit is the equal light which shines forth through the begotten light and has the cause of His hypostasis from the prototypal light. But even concerning this phraseology of Maximus and Damascene and their genuine opinion, those considerations demonstrated in Treatise Thesis XXXVI, n. II, suffice.

Note: Διὰ γεννητοῦ φωτὸς ἐκλάμπον. It is evident, of course, that "shining forth" is said of an immanent procession; indeed, by this very word Nyssa in the context also designates the generation of the Son: Ἐν περινοίᾳ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου φωτός καταστάντες, ἐκεῖθεν πάλιν τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ φῶς κατὰ τὸ προσεχές ἐνοήσαμεν, οἷον ἀκτῖνά τινα τῷ ἡλίῳ συνεφισταμένην... μᾶλλον οὐχὶ ἀκτῖνα ἐξ ἡλίου νοήσομεν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐξ ἀγεννήτου ἡλίου ἄλλον ἥλιον, ὁμοῦ τῇ τοῦ πρώτου ἐπινοίᾳ γεννητῶς αὐτῷ συνεκλάμποντα... καὶ πάλιν ἕτερον τοιοῦτον φῶς, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον οὐ χρονικῷ τινι διαστήματι τοῦ γεννητοῦ φωτὸς ἀποτεμνόμενον, ἀλλὰ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ μὲν ἐκλάμπον, τὴν δὲ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αἰτίαν ἔχον ἐκ τοῦ πρωτοτύπου φωτός, 1. c. 416. That is to say, in the same way that the primordial light is understood not in time but as principle with respect to the light that shines forth from it by generation, so too the begotten light is understood not prior in time but as principle with respect to the light that shines forth through it and has its cause from the primordial light. For from this primordial light there shines forth the begotten light itself, through which the third light shines forth (as Epiphanius calls the Spirit, ὡς τρίτον παρὰ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ, Haer. 74, n. 8). This order of principle and of what proceeds from the principle Nyssa explains again a little further below, where, with respect to the Holy Spirit, he explicitly gives to the Son the name of "cause," just as, above, he had said that the Holy Spirit has the cause of His hypostasis from the primordial light (the Father) yet shines forth through the

begotten light. "We profess the Son to be eternal and yet not ingenerate. For as begotten He is joined to the ingenerate Father. And the same is our doctrine about the Holy Spirit, establishing distinction in the order (of the Persons) alone. For just as the Son is joined to the Father and, having His being from Him, is not posterior in existence, so too the Holy Spirit depends upon the Only-begotten, who is conceived only in thought, according to the notion of cause, as prior to the hypostasis of the Spirit; whereas temporal dimensions have no place in that eternal life, so that, apart from the notion of cause, the Persons of the Most Holy Trinity are in no respect distinguished among themselves." Ὅτι (ὁ υἱός) γεννητῶς τῇ ἀγεννησίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς συναπτόμενος... Ὡς γὰρ συνάπτεται τῷ πατρὶ ὁ υἱός, καὶ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ εἶναι ἔχων οὐχ ὑστερίζει κατὰ τὴν ὕπαρξιν, οὕτω καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἔχεται τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἐπινοίᾳ μόνῃ κατὰ τὸν τῆς αἰτίας λόγον προθεωρουμένου τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος ὑποστάσεως... ὡς τοῦ λόγου τῆς αἰτίας ὑπεξηρημένου ἐν μηδενὶ τὴν ἁγίαν τριάδα πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἀσυμφώνως ἔχειν. L. I, p. 464.

What concerns the agreeing doctrine of the Eastern and Western Fathers—who, in express words, by declaring the economy of the Most Holy Trinity, that is, the order and relations among the three divine Persons, explain the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Father and the Son," insofar as They are one in spiration, or "from the Father through the Son," insofar as the Son has from the Father, as primordial principle, the spiration communicated—this consensus of the Fathers we have set forth in our Treatise by testimonies that admit of no sophistic twisting; thus, there is no need to demonstrate the same again here. We have heard the Fathers at one time explicitly teaching that the eternal principle of the Holy Spirit is the Father and the Son, that the Spirit proceeds from the essence of the Father and the Son, or that He proceeds from both, or that, because the Spirit proceeds from the Father, it is not lawful to deny that He likewise

proceeds from the Son; at another time, the same Fathers, especially in places written against the Arians, teach that, because the Spirit proceeds from the Son, the procession from the Father is thereby demonstrated, and that the Spirit, according to Scripture, proceeds from the Father for this reason: just as the Spirit receives all that He has from the Son, so also the Son has all that is His—and therefore also the spirative power—from the Father; and on that account the Father is the principle of the whole Deity. Now who does not see that in each of these two series of testimonies there is fullest agreement, and that, for the right understanding of the Fathers' complete opinion, the latter testimonies must be joined to the former? For these latter state the Catholic dogma of procession "from the Father," and, when joined to the former, they explain the true and revealed sense of the dogma according to the unity and distinction and order of the three divine Persons. Therefore, whoever keeps before his eyes only the demonstration of the origin of the Persons and of procession "from the Father" and of the unity of principle in the Trinity—contained merely in the second series of testimonies—views the doctrine of the Fathers inadequately and from only one side, albeit a very true one. But whoever takes those testimonies in a sense that excludes and denies the procession of the Spirit also from the Son perverts the whole doctrine of the Fathers: not only because he denies their explicit and concordant profession of procession from the Son contained in the first series of testimonies, but also because he twists the very affirmation of procession "from the Father" into a sense utterly alien to the ancients, as if the Father were distinguished from the Son by spiration. Thus, together with the negation of procession from the Son, he simultaneously perverts the true sense of the dogma of procession "from the Father." For the dogma which we Catholics profess with the Fathers—namely, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and that the Father is the principle of the Holy Spirit—is not

the same as that which the Photians assert in the same words but in another sense; just as one dogma is professed when Catholics in the Creed confess "one God, the Father, creator of heaven and earth," and another when the Arians recite the same words in a different sense. We Catholics believe that the Father, together with the Son and the Holy Spirit, is the one God, creator of all things; the Arians suppose that the Father alone, to the exclusion of the Son and the Holy Spirit, is the true God. By the same reasoning, we Catholics profess that from the Father—the first Person, who is one with the Son, the second Person, in spiration and in the mission and manifestation of the same Spirit—the Holy Spirit proceeds; the Photians, using the same words, divide the Father from the Son and deny the unity of the Persons in all things where there is no opposing relation of origin of the one from the other.

Now Macarius, by heaping up across many pages testimonies from the second series just described and concluding from them that the ancients unanimously taught that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone (to the exclusion of the Son), perverts the doctrine of the Saints in both ways: by denying that which they unanimously teach in the prior series of testimonies, and by substituting for the testimonies in the second series a sense that is repugnant both to the universal doctrine of the Fathers and to the very words themselves when considered immediately in themselves, inasmuch as he transforms a most certain affirmative proposition of faith—"the Spirit proceeds from the Father"—into his own proposition that excludes: "the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone and not from the Son." Hence it comes about that, from this Photian perversion, the holy Doctors are presented to us with shameless mockery not merely as contradicting one another, but each as contradicting himself, since they are said in some places to deny and exclude the dogma which in other places they expressly profess and teach.

§ II.
On Macarius's Division of the Fathers into Four Classes, & On Certain Errors Incidentally Noted

Let us look in detail—not now at his method, which here, aside from the truncation of some texts, does not appear, but—at the incredible confidence with which Macarius piles together the statements of the ancients in order to foist upon the holy Fathers his negation of procession from the Son. He divides the testimonies into four classes. 1) Some (he says) teach that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, making no mention of the Son; 2) others profess procession from the Father, but ascribe to the Son not procession but something else—mission or manifes-tation; 3) others affirm that the Father alone is the principle and fountain whence the Son and the Holy Spirit go forth; 4) others in every way exclude—at least by sense, or even in express words—the notion of procession from the Son.

At first glance this division appears absurd and unfitted to the proposed aim. For if what is common to the first three classes is not the very point at issue—namely, that they expressly, or at least in sense, exclude procession from the Son—but this remains proper only to the fourth class, then that whole heap of the first three divisions is brought in to no purpose and is irrelevant. And indeed, what Catholic theologian is there who does not profess those three things? Yet this profession is entirely consistent—and even, if the Fathers' doctrine about the relations and order of the three Persons be kept in view (as we demonstrated in the Treatise), is included in that very profession—with the statement that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, in such wise that the Father is one with the Son both in the spiration and in the mission and manifestation of the same Spirit; and that the Father is the principle not only of the generation of the Son but also of the procession of the Holy Spirit, since the Son does not

have of Himself, but from the Father, that the Spirit proceeds also "from Him." In this way the μοναρχία is safeguarded—namely, both the unity of principle in the Trinity and thereby the consubstantiality of the Persons and the numerical unity of the Godhead.

Much more, however—I do not know whether it evokes admiration or indignation—does that inflated division do so when the names of the Fathers are read, who are paraded as if opponents of Catholic doctrine. Macarius cites in all his four classes Cyril of Alexandria and Augustine; in three, or at least in some of them, Origen, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, Anastasius of Antioch, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Leo the Great, Vigilius of Thapsus, Paschasius the deacon, Fulgentius, and Gregory the Great. Yet the explicit doctrine—or even most lucid explication—of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son we have seen from all of these in our Treatise, and for some of them even in this very appendix (Anastasius, p. 65; Ambrose, p. 41; Jerome, p. 45; Paschasius, p. 23, note).

He adds other Greeks and Latins, the declaimer does; but since those numbered in the first three classes, to a man—even as they are cited by Macarius—say absolutely nothing other than what all Catholics believe and profess, no other reply is needed besides that given to such citations of the Fathers at the Council of Florence: "To all these points the Latins gave one common answer: that all are most true, and that they hold the same; for they too believe that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father (as from the first Person of the Trinity, and hence that the Son, the second Person, has His being from the Father begetting, so that from the Son begotten the third Person proceeds; and thereby the Father is the principium, τὴν αἰτίαν, of the Son and the Holy Spirit). For this, in truth, is not contrary to their dogma" (see in the Treatise, Thesis XXXIX).

Nevertheless, I shall note a few things by the way, to the commendation of Macarius's "erudition." Without doubt in Chrysostom—as in all the other Fathers—there are many testimonies in which the Spirit is said to proceed from the Father. For what reason, then, do I not know, did it rather please Macarius to introduce, as if from Chrysostom, a single text (66) taken from a spurious homily on Psalm 115, which is found in the Latin edition of Nivelle, vol. I, p. 977, pertaining to Latin trifles, as Montfaucon describes them in general (Preface to vol. V, §17)?

---

66 What, in fact, Macarius ultimately wished to extract from that homily is quite astonishing, since there is in it nothing other than this very true description of the Macedonian heresy: "The Macedonians did not believe that the Holy Spirit, who ineffably proceeds from the Father, is God." (See about this heresy, Thesis XXXVIII.) If, once he had resolved to bring something from the homilies on the Psalms wrongly attributed to Chrysostom to confirm the opinion of the ancient Greeks, the Photian had wanted, he could have read the homily on Ps. 96, n. 4 (vol. V, p. 608, ed. Migne, PG 55), which Savile and Tillemont ascribe to Severianus. There, in agreement with other Greek Fathers (see Thesis XXXVI, n. I, 2d), the procession of the Holy Spirit is thus declared: "If the Holy Spirit is living water and believers receive Him, why did You say, 'If anyone thirst, let him come to me,' and not, 'If anyone thirst, let him come to the Holy Spirit'? But even if He said, 'to me,' truly He said so; for one (the Father) is the fountain of both (the Son and the Spirit)... Which fountain? Let Jeremiah say (Jer. 2:13): 'Me they forsook, the fountain of living water.' The Father is the fountain of living water, the Son is the river issuing from the earth, the Holy Spirit is the water of the river. 'Me they forsook, the fountain of living water.' Let the prophet Isaiah say the same of the Son (Is. 32:2): 'And the Lord will come as a glorious river upon the thirsty land.' Do you see the fountain, the river, the living water?" πηγὴ ὕδατος ζῶντος ὁ πατήρ, ποταμὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς προερχόμενος ὁ υἱός, ὕδωρ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον... ὁρᾷς πηγὴν, ποταμόν, ὕδωρ ζῶν;

Further, Macarius cites twice (pp. 378, 383) from the Cologne Library of the Fathers, in Greek words, Book I De fide orthodoxa of Anastasius of Sinai. But there is no Greek text in that Cologne collection, nor are there any books of Anastasius "De fide orthodoxa." Rather, there exist five orations, the first of which is De SS. Trinitate, from Turrianus's translation. From this oration of Anastasius, nos. 10, 11, and 23 are taken what Macarius brings forward; but the Greek words appear to be nothing other than Eugenius the Bulgar's rendering—he who published Zoernikav's heap in Greek—made from Turrianus's Latin ([67]). As to what Anastasius (who is certainly not the Sinaita, but another, a bishop of Antioch at the close of the sixth century) teaches in that very oration on the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, we have set forth above (p. 65). See Gallandius, vol. XII, or Migne, vol. LXXXIX.

I will say nothing of the Mystical Theology of Germanus ([68]) of Constantinople, from which a text is cited that is in itself entirely

[67] In the words cited by Macarius, only this one point is stated—what all the Fathers and Catholics profess: that from the Father the Son is begotten, and the Holy Spirit proceeds; and that the properties are: of the Father alone, to be "ingenerate" and "principle"; of the Son alone, to be "begotten"; of the Holy Spirit alone, procession.

[68] Macarius's translator seems to have thought this man was a "German" not by name but by nation; for he calls him (p. 372) "Saint Hermann, Patriarch of Constantinople."

Catholic and in accord with the locutions of other Fathers (69), though it could also, in a distorted sense, have been employed even after Photius by a schismatic. For that "Theology," or explanation of the liturgy, is assigned by critical scholars—Fronton du Duc, Gretser, Allatius, Oudin, Fabricius, the author of the Supplement to Bellarmine's De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, and others—not to St. Germanus I of the eighth century but to Germanus II, who lived in the thirteenth century, long after Photius and Cerularius. Gallandius —or rather Gallandius's successor in editing the Bibliotheca (vol. XIII)—with reasons not, to be sure, of great weight, suggests that the work is by Germanus I; but he adds: "It must, however, be admitted that by others other things have been inserted; wherefore one can scarcely distinguish the work's genuine offspring of Germanus." >>> Moreover, our Photius finds somewhere the name of Thalassius, an African monk, and, without inquiring anything further, immediately places him among the Western Fathers; for the man is greedily eager to find something at least ambiguously said among ancient Latin

69 The words of this writer are: "The Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father and rests in the Son... For just as the sun is the source and cause of the ray and of illumination, yet through the ray illumination is communicated to us... so indeed God the Father is the source and cause of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; but the Spirit, proceeding from the Father, is given and has been manifested through the Son." ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος πηγὴ καὶ αἰτία τῆς τε ἀκτῖνος καὶ τῆς ἐλλάμψεως ὤν, διὰ δὲ τῆς ἀκτῖνος ἡμῖν ἡ ἔλλαμψις μεταδίδοται... οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πηγὴ ὢν καὶ αἰτία υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος· τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐκ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον δι᾽ υἱοῦ διαδίδοται καὶ πεφανέρωται (Migne, p. 431). See Th. XXXIII, n. I, 20; XXXV, n. I; cf. Th. XXX, n. II.

writers (70). But Thalassius was not a writer of the sixth century (as Macarius says) but a Greek monk of the seventh century, contemporary with St. Maximus, to whom are ascribed the four "Hecatontades," or centuries of brief sentences, in Greek and Latin, published both elsewhere and in Gallandius (vol. XIII; Migne, vol. XCI). If Macarius reckons the writers of the Alexandrian patriarchate among the Westerners, he will indeed secure for himself no small increase of number—but none for his cause. That Macarius even now, after so many demonstrations to the contrary by learned men, makes

---

70 He places Thalassius in his third class among those who state the Catholic dogma that the Father is the principle and fountain of the whole Trinity. If heretical prejudices had not dulled his mind, he could easily have seen that, in the very place he brings forward, Thalassius shows that the Father and the Son—that is, the Father through the Son—are one principle of the Person proceeding, just as the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit, is one creator. "The holy Doctors know one principle of all things: the Father—of the Son and of the Spirit indeed as the eternal begetter and fountain... but of creatures as creator and provider and judge, through the Son, that is, in the Holy Spirit." ἀρχὴν δὲ μίαν τῶν ὅλων τὸν πατέρα οἴδασιν, τοῦ μὲν υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ὡς γεννήτορα καὶ πηγὴν ἀΐδιον... τῶν δὲ κτισμάτων ὡς δημιουργὸν καὶ προνοητὴν καὶ κριτήν, δι᾽ υἱοῦ δηλαδὴ ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι. Cent. IV, n. 99 (Migne, p. 1469). Thus, the one principle of all things is the Father—both of the Persons ad intra and of creatures ad extra; this, however, does not prevent the Son and the Holy Spirit from being, together with the Father, one principle of creatures, because, in creation, the Father is not opposed to the Son and the Spirit, and therefore is not distinguished by it but is one with Them not less by creation than by nature. Therefore, because the Father, as the one principle of the Holy Spirit, is not opposed to the Son by spiration, and for that very reason is not distinguished from the second Person by it, the first, through the second Person, is one principle of the third Person, just as the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit, is one principle of creatures.

St. Prosper a bishop of Reggio (p. 380)—and that not in Gaul (Riez), as earlier some did, but in Italy ("évêque de Reggio")—I shall merely note. His confirmation of the Photian heresy from Prosper—as I shall now indicate very briefly—is just as absurd as that identical proof which he dared to attempt from Augustine and Fulgentius, those great doctors and illustrators of the faith concerning the procession from the Father and the Son. I have sufficiently described Augustine's and Fulgentius's doctrine, together with Macarius's corruptions and unheard-of frauds, in Treatise Thesis XXXV, n. II. Prosper, in the place from which our Photian took his truncated citation, has nothing other than Augustine's own words from the celebrated Tractate 99 on John—in which Augustine not only teaches the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, but also explains the manner whereby the Father and the Son are one principle of the same. Augustine namely declares, against what the Arians taught, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father consubstantial with Him; and he adds that, by the very fact that the third Person proceeds from the first, He proceeds from the first insofar as the Father is one with the Son, the second Person—because the Father, by begetting the Son, communicates to Him, besides being Father, all things. Accordingly, the spirative power, numerically one, is to be believed communicated by the Father to the Son. In his book of the Sentences of Augustine, Prosper describes both: namely, the

procession from the Father (sent. 370) ([71]) and the communication of spiration from the Father to the Son (sent. 371) ([72]). Macarius, after his fashion, cites only the former sentence and twists that affirmative to an excluding sense; the latter part he suppresses, because in it there is, in express words, an explanation of the affirmation of procession "from the Father" as including procession "from the Son."

Macarius provides another specimen of erudition and of Greek fidelity at once. He cites (p. 373), in the vernacular and in Latin, a text from St. Gregory the Great: "cum Paraclitus Spiritus a Patre procedat et in Filio maneat." These words suffice for the man to include Gregory in his second class of testimonies—those who (as he says), while asserting the procession of the Spirit "from the Father," ascribe to the Son something else, something particular, and thereby

---

[71] "The Father has life in Himself, nor is He anything other than the Life that is in Him; and He gave to the Son to have life in Himself—that is, He begot the Son, who also is Life. Thus also we must take what is said of the Holy Spirit: 'He will not speak from Himself, but whatever He shall hear He will speak' (John 16:13), so that we may understand that He is not 'from Himself.' For the Father alone is not 'from another.' For both the Son and the Holy Spirit proceed from the Father... Nor therefore is there any inequality in that highest Trinity... because both the Son is equal to Him of whom He is begotten, and the Holy Spirit to Him from whom He proceeds." Macarius, here as in Augustine, Contra Maximinum II, 2, places all the force upon the singular number—that it is said: "He is equal to him from whom he proceeds," not "to them." Assuredly, by this Russian hermeneutic it would be concluded that the Holy Spirit is equal to the Father but by no means to the Son; but I have spoken about this argument in the Treatise, p. 502, note 3.

[72] "No one can say that the Holy Spirit is not Life, since the Father is Life, the Son is Life. And therefore, just as the Father—when He has life in Himself—also gave to the Son to have life in Himself, so He gave to Him (the Son) that Life (the Spirit) should proceed from Him, just as He also proceeds from Himself."

more clearly prove that the ancients did not believe the procession of the Holy Spirit also from the Son.

In reality, if Gregory had written thus (as it is produced), he would certainly have used a manner of speaking more familiar to the earlier Greek Fathers than to the Latins of the close of the sixth century; yet he would have said nothing alien to the Catholic dogma or in any way coherent with the Photian heresy that was to arise three centuries later. For by those words—before the question of heretics had been stirred up—the profession of the immanent procession "from the Father through the Son" could have been sufficiently expressed, to be sure less contentiously and less explicitly, as happens in most other dogmas at an earlier stage of simple faith. Nevertheless, in Gregory—who, in declaring dogmas and notably in explaining the doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit, is wont almost to adhere to Augustine's very words—this expression, bearing a Greek rather than a Latin color, would have had no small note of surprise. Let us ask, then, where Macarius found those Latin words. With very cautious brevity he indicates to his pupils: "in Dialogo II. cap. ultimo secundum graecam versionem; confer Theophanem Prokopowicz Theolog. vol. I, p. 1010." But St. Gregory wrote in Latin, not in Greek, and Macarius himself cites the Latin text, which alone we seek. And as to how the Greek version corresponds to the original text, and of what trustworthiness it is, we shall not learn from the apostate Prokopowicz. We know this man: whenever testimonies appear too clear to be twisted into an alien sense, he shamelessly and foolishly cries the one thing—that all the writings of all the Fathers were corrupted by the Latins—an apology which alone, even to the Greeks themselves, seemed absurd at the Council of Florence, as Bessarion attests (see in our Treatise, Thesis XXXIX, p. 588).

Now, in the Latin text to which Macarius appeals, Gregory—fully consenting with himself elsewhere in many places, with

Augustine, with Fulgentius, and with the rest of the Fathers—has the following: "For since it is established that the Paraclete Spirit always proceeds from the Father and from the Son, why does the Son say that He will depart, so that That One may come, who never departs from the Son?" (namely, for this very reason, because from the Son He proceeds by an immanent procession), Dialogues, II, c. 38. The Greek version now extant is interpolated—though in a different manner from that by which Macarius, at his own pleasure, cites the testimony as if it were Gregory's. For the Greeks now have: "Manifestum igitur est, Paracletum Spiritum a Patre procedere et in Filio manere. Cur ergo Filius se recessurum dicit, ut ille veniat, qui ab ipso numquam est separatus?" (73). That the words of the original have been altered in this version admits of no doubt and can admit of none among critics; for the integrity of the Latin text is established by

73 Φανερόν οὖν ὑπάρχει, ὅτι τὸ παράκλητον πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς προέρχεται, καὶ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ διαμένει. Τίνος οὖν χάριν ἑαυτὸν ὁ υἱὸς πορευθῆναι λέγει, ἵνα ἐκεῖνος ἔλθῃ, ὅστις οὐδέποτε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐχωρίσθη; Anyone can see that, in this version, the entire grammatical construction is altered. The procession "from the Father" and the abiding "in the Son" are put as a consequent from what precedes, whereas nothing has gone before from which these could at least of themselves and immediately be inferred. Gregory, by contrast, in the original text posits absolutely the procession "from the Father and the Son" as the premise, from which the following question arises—how the saying of Christ, "If I do not go, the Paraclete will not come to you," is reconciled with the immanent procession from the Son. Macarius, with his masters, retained the construction of the original at his pleasure and transferred the words that pleased him out of the Greek version.

the consent of all the manuscripts and editions (74), and equally by its agreement, as to matter and mode of speaking, with all Gregory's other places where he mentions the procession of the Holy Spirit. Already in the creed by which, at the beginning of his pontificate, he fortified the right faith and dissipated all heresies (as John the Deacon says in the Life of Gregory II, n. 2), the profession is this: "Credo in unum Deum... Patrem ingenitum, Filium genitum, Spiritum vero Sanctum nec genitum nec ingenitum, sed coaeternum de Patre et Filio procedentem" (John the Deacon, loc. cit.). In like manner, as in the cited text of the Dialogues, he joins elsewhere the procession and the inseparable immanence in the Son: "Christ has the Holy Spirit in a manner far different from holy men sanctified by grace: He has Him both always and continually present, because from Him the same Spirit is put forth according to substance... Differently, therefore, does He remain in Him from whom, by nature, He never departs" (Moralia II, n. 92). Speaking of the beatific vision, he declares likewise the Spirit's going-forth—or production—from both (the Father and the Son): "By the manifestation then of the appearance of His majesty, He shows both how He is begotten not unequal to the Begetter, and how the Spirit of both, coeternal to both, proceeds. For then we shall clearly see how that which is by being begotten is not subsequent to Him of whom He is begotten; how He who is produced by procession is not preceded by Those who precede" (ibid., XXX, n. 17). See also I, n. 30, and that most splendid place which we

74 The Maurist editors collated twenty-five codices, some of which reach at least to the age of Photius; and in them they found no variant reading as to this place (Preface to Dialogues I, n. 23). Moreover, that in the time of Photius the same Latin reading remained intact—after the corruption of the Greek version had already occurred—we are made certain by John the Deacon, of whom I shall speak presently.

have cited elsewhere, Homilies on the Gospels II, hom. 26, n. 2; cf. Moralia V, n. 65.

As regards the corruption of the Greek version, the testimony of John the Deacon is of the highest moment, who in the Life of St. Gregory IV, n. 75, writes thus: "These books (the Dialogues) were translated into the Greek tongue by Zachary, bishop of the holy Roman Church (A.D. 741–752), and were made known to the Eastern churches, although the crafty perversity of the Greeks, in mentioning the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Father, of their own accord erased and removed the name of the Son" (75). John the Deacon wrote his Life of Gregory—so he says in the preface—at the command, with the favor, and under the judgment of John VIII (A.D. 872–882); and thus these writings were composed and dedicated to that Pontiff—whom the impostor Photius calls "his John" (Mystagogy, n. 89)—a few years after Photius began, in his encyclical letter, in another to the king of Bulgaria, and in the Conventicle of 867, to attack the Catholic dogma; indeed, probably even after the frauds perpetrated in the Conventicle of 880 against that same John VIII had become better known at Rome and had been condemned by the same Pontiff, of which we shall speak below.

From these points the following are manifest. (a) At the very time of Photius and at the rise of his heresy, the preaching in the Roman Church of the dogma of the procession of the Holy Spirit also from the Son was common and indubitable, and the Photian doctrine was judged a profane novelty resting on frauds. (b) John VIII, in the same preaching of the dogma, fully agreed with his predecessors; and hence both the praises which Photius slyly bestows upon John in the

---

75 It is understood by itself that, against this testimony of John as well, Theophanes Prokopowicz and other schismatics, without witnesses and by sheer arbitrariness, oppose their customary apology: that all things are spurious and were later interpolated by the Latins.

Mystagogy and in the letter to the Bishop of Aquileia, and the absurd letter forged by the Greeks under John's name—in which the Catholic doctrine is accused of blasphemy—are mere calumnies. (c) With great probability—among others—the Maurist editors of Gregory's works attributed the corruption of the Greek version in Dialogues II, c. 38 (of which we are speaking) to Photius himself. A man who is convicted of having most shamelessly corrupted the letters of the Pontiffs Nicholas I and John VIII while they were still alive; who forged, or interpolated, intact documents (e.g., the letter of St. Ignatius, while still living; cf. Hergenroether, vol. I, p. 524) and the acts of the Conventicles which he himself gathered—such a man certainly had a mind most ready to pervert a book of Gregory which, translated into Greek and held in high esteem among the Orientals (76), would condemn the new heresy in explicit words. Since moreover the corruption occurred before the year 882—that is, before the death of Pope John VIII, to whom John the Deacon dedicated his Life of Gregory—no one of that age fitter for such a crime than the impostor Photius can be found. Nor, furthermore, was an opportune time lacking for the trickster, from the year 862 onward, when, condemned by Pope Nicholas, he began to plot open rebellion against the Catholic Church. It is true, indeed, that even as the passage stands in the corrupted Greek version, there is in it no refuge for the Photian heresy; but to Photius—as later to all his followers—it was enough that the Holy Spirit be said to proceed

---

76 Hence the argument of Scipio Maffei (ad Anastas. Bibliothec., in Vita Zachariae, Migne vol. CXXVIII, p. 1079): that Gregory's explicit testimonies for the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Father and the Son" remain intact in his other books. This does not remove the suspicion of forgery from Photius: for those other testimonies are not proved to have existed in Greek, and most probably they were unknown either to Photius himself or certainly to other Greeks on whom he sought to impose.

"from the Father," without the procession from the Son being expressed by the same word. This argument he drums up, after his manner, with inflated declamation from this very corrupted testimony in the Mystagogy (nn. 84–86), appealing to the authority of Gregory and of Pope Zachary at once.

Therefore, the passage of Gregory which Macarius cites in interpolated form, in its original and genuine reading explicitly condemns the Photian heresy; in the interpolated reading it in no way includes it. That the corruption—most certain—should be ascribed to no one other than Photius himself, already convicted elsewhere as a falsifier, remains probable even after the remarks made by the distinguished Hergenroether in his excellent work (Photius, vol. II, p. 546; vol. III, p. 427; cf. his note 9 on the Mystagogy, n. 84).

We have seen how habitual it is for Macarius to produce some words from the Fathers which, in the end, say nothing other than what is already admitted—that the Spirit proceeds from the Father—then to cry out in ridiculous fashion that all the ancients taught the procession of the Spirit "from the Father alone," while fraudulently suppressing the explanation which, in those same places or in others, they give on purpose: namely, that the power of spirating, as it is originally in the Father, is numerically the same communicated to the Son; and therefore that the Spirit proceeds "from the Father and the Son," or "from the Father through the Son." He exercises this art of perversion upon all the Fathers named by us above; but he does so more audaciously than with the rest in Epiphanius, Cyril, Augustine, Prosper, Fulgentius, and Gregory, as is abundantly clear from our Treatise and from what we have often demonstrated above in this little work. Indeed, he even traduces as if enslaved to contrary doctrine—or at least not alien from it—those very Western writers who had already in some manner undertaken to explain and vindicate, in a polemical mode, the profession of

procession "from the Father and the Son": the Fathers of Toledo (above, p. 81), Paulinus of Aquileia (Thesis XLI), Alcuin (of whom we shall speak below), the Fathers of the Council of Aachen, and even Leo III (pp. 82 sqq.); their testimonies he seeks, by these same arts, to pervert and suppress.

§ III.
On the So-Called Photian Doctrine Said to Have Prevailed in The Ninth Century Within the Western Church Itself

With astonishing confidence, our Russian Metropolitan appeals to the writers of the ninth century, Rabanus Maurus and Haymo of Halberstadt, who (so he says) professed the procession of the Holy Spirit in no other way than the Greeks now do; whence it is concluded that, even after the Council of Aachen and after the responses given by Leo III, within the Western Church itself not all had yet admitted the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the

Son, but that many still strictly (rigoureusement) held the procession from the Father alone (77).

From the state of ecclesiastical affairs in the ninth century, especially in Germany, and, so to speak, a priori, without looking into the texts, it is evident even to a novice in history that it could by no means have happened that Rabanus and Haymo—students of Alcuin, later celebrated teachers under Louis the Pious and his sons, and finally bishops—did not believe and teach the dogma of faith concerning the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son,

---

77 Macarius's words are most noteworthy, to make it clear once again what absurdities can be served out by Popes with impunity, the more securely to foster prejudices born of supine ignorance. "Parmi les auteurs de l'Occident cités par nous, il en est deux, Haymo et Raban Maur qui vécurent au neuvième siècle, à une époque où la question qui nous occupe, avait été déjà expressément examinée au Concile d'Aix-la-Chapelle, puis par le pape même, et pourtant ces deux-là professèrent la procession du Saint-Esprit comme nous le faisons. Qu'est-ce que cela prouve? N'est-ce pas que, même en Occident, et au neuvième siècle, tout le monde n'avait point encore consenti à reconnaître le faux dogme d'Aix-la-Chapelle (paulo ante p. 364 dixerat, Aquisgrani post acres disceptationes nihil fuisse decisum cf. supra p. 83), et qu'il y avait des gens, qui tenaient rigoureusement à l'ancienne doctrine de l'Église?" p. 370.

Translation: "Among the authors of the West whom we have cited, there are two—Haymo and Rabanus Maurus—who lived in the ninth century, at a time when the question that concerns us had already been expressly examined at the Council of Aachen and then by the Pope himself, and yet those two professed the procession of the Holy Spirit as we do. What does that prove? Is it not that, even in the West and in the ninth century, not everyone had yet consented to recognize the false dogma of Aachen (a little earlier on p. 364 he had said that at Aachen, after sharp disputes, nothing had been decided; cf. supra p. 83), and that there were people who adhered rigorously to the ancient doctrine of the Church)?"

which from their earliest years they professed in the Creed. Nevertheless, let the testimonies of each writer be produced.

1º That Haymo strictly denied the procession from the Son, Macarius proves by none other than these words of his: "He is called the Spirit of truth because He proceeds from the Father of truth" (Homil. 87 in dominic. 4 post pascha, Migne CXVIII, p. 519). But the question is not whether Haymo, together with all Catholics against the Arians and Macedonians, professes the procession from the Father, of which he is here speaking. By these words he explicitly affirms nothing—and he neither explicitly nor implicitly denies anything—about the procession from the Son, which is the very point Macarius is disputing. What Haymo taught concerning this, some time before the rise of the Photian heresy, our most candid disputant could have found repeated twice, a few lines later in the same homily; and from this he would simultaneously have learned that among the ancients—as now still among all Catholics—the procession "from the Father" is understood inasmuch as the Father and the Son are one in spiration. For Haymo there subjoins the following, which Macarius suppresses: "The Holy Spirit will not speak from Himself, because He proceeds from the Father and the Son... The Holy Spirit is said to receive from the Father because He proceeds indivisibly from the Father and the Son; whence there follows: 'All things that the Father has are mine'" (ibid., p. 520). He declares the same doctrine again, first from the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father (for all things of the Father—*ἀγεννησία* and paternity excepted—are also the Son's); then from the notion of mission, which is the temporal manifestation of the eternal procession; whence, just as a mission from the Son includes a mission from the Father, so a procession from the Father includes that same procession from the Son; and, finally, from the very name "Spirit," which, taken hypostatically, is relative to the Father and the Son,

whence "Spirit," that is, "spirated," is said to be of the Father and likewise of the Son. "And rightly," he says, "does the Son assert that the Spirit is sent by Himself and proceeds from the Father (Io. XV. 26), not that He proceeds one way from the Father and another from the Son, or is sent one way by the Son and another by the Father, but because the very mission is procession and the very procession is mission (vide supra p. 24 sqq. et Th. XXXIII). For there is no diversity of the one who proceeds or of the one who sends, since their essence is one and their Godhead coequal... Since He is the Spirit of both, coeternal and consubstantial, as He proceeds from the Father so also from the Son; and as He is sent by the Son, He is sent by the Father. That He is the Spirit of the Father the Lord manifests in the Gospel (Matth. X. 20)... That He is the Spirit of the Son the Apostle Paul shows (Rom. VIII. 9)" (Hom. 98, ibid., p. 551). He speaks still more expressly elsewhere about this relative signification of the name: "Because He proceeds from the Father and the Son, therefore the Holy Spirit is predicated 'God,' and He has His [i.e., God's] substance; for nothing else could have proceeded from the Father than what the Father Himself is. Moreover, 'Spirit' is said according to that which is referred to something: certainly 'breathing' and 'inbreathing,' and from this He is called 'Spirit' (ex operatione ad extra); but properly and in a certain manner He is called 'Holy Spirit' according to that by which He is referred to the Father and the Son, namely, that He is their Spirit" (Hom. 106, ibid., p. 574). Further, he thus sets forth the proper and the common [properties] of the three Persons: "The Father has eternity without nativity; the Son has eternity with nativity; the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. Therefore the Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten, the Holy Spirit neither begotten—take care not to be deceived—nor unbegotten, but He proceeds from the Father and from the Son" (Hom. 12 de Sanctis, ibid., p. 798). He repeats the same twice: hom.

51, p. 300; hom. 100, p. 558. Finally, like many other Fathers, Haymo teaches that the Lord's breathing upon the Apostles (Io. XX. 22) is a symbolic expression of the procession of the Holy Spirit also from the Son (vide supra p. 63 sqq.): "By breathing He gave the Holy Spirit, to show that all divinity is in Himself, and that just as the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, so also from Himself" (Hom. 81, p. 493).

I think these statements suffice for understanding with what "faith" Haymo is said to have strictly denied the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son.

2º The same accusation appears, if possible, still more shameless against Rabanus of Mainz. The foundation of Macarius's declamation consists of two passages in which Rabanus, describing the common doctrine against the Arians from Augustine, states that the Father is the origin of the divinity, "inasmuch as from the Father, the first Person of the Trinity, the Son, the second Person, is begotten, and the Holy Spirit, the third Person, proceeds. For the Spirit will not speak from Himself, perhaps because He is not from Himself; for the Father alone is not from another, the Son is begotten from the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father. For the Holy Spirit will hear from Him from whom He proceeds, because He is not from Himself but from Him from whom He proceeds. From whom He has understanding, from Him indeed [He has] knowledge; from Him, therefore, [He has] hearing, which is nothing other than knowledge... The Holy Spirit receives from the Father because He proceeds from the Father, from whom also the Son is born; but He who is born from no one and proceeds from no one is the Father alone" (Homiliar. P. II, hom. 35, Migne CX, p. 212). The same is said in another place: "The Father is the origin of the divinity, since just as the Son is begotten from the Father, so also the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, whom in the Gospel (Io. IV. 13; VII. 38–39) the Lord named under the title of water" (in Ecclesi. l. VI, c. 2, Migne CIX, p. 943).

As with many other things in his homilies (which are rather commentaries on Scripture), Rabanus also transcribed these from Augustine. The former passage appears in Augustine, Tractate 99 on John, where the holy Doctor first (n. 3–5) explains the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father; in this first part of the tractate (n. 4–5) are the very words that Rabanus transcribed. In the second part (n. 6–9) Augustine declares how, in that very procession from the Father, the procession from the Son is also to be understood: "For from whom the Son has that He is God—for He is God from God—from Him He assuredly has that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from Him; and thus the Holy Spirit, in that He also proceeds from the Son just as He proceeds from the Father, has this from the Father Himself" (ibid., n. 8). A twofold [parallel] stands in 1. contra sermon. Arianorum nn. 19–20 and in the other places of Augustine cited in Th. XXXV. The other testimony adduced from Rabanus on Ecclesiastes VI contains that common dictum of the Fathers and theologians, that the first Person of the Most Holy Trinity is the origin of the divinity, that is, of the Persons proceeding through the communication of the one divinity—from the Father to the Son, and from the Father through the Son, or from the Father and the Son, to the third Person, the Holy Spirit, a doctrine which Rabanus's principal predecessor, Augustine, explains: de Trin. l. IV, n. 29; XV, nn. 29, 47; contra Maximin. l. II, c. 14, n. 1; in Ioan., tract. 99, nn. 8–9 (vide Thesim XXXV). Therefore, each testimony cited by Macarius, from which he sets out to prove that Rabanus strictly denied the procession of the Spirit also from the Son, not only does not deny it but implicitly affirms it, since the words can be understood only in the sense they have in their source—namely, in Augustine's writings. But there is no need to appeal to an implicit sense, since Rabanus himself, in many places, has made this sense explicit and has declared

to be a matter of Catholic faith the very doctrine that he is said strictly to have denied.

Note: Excellent after Augustine, Fulgentius expresses this: "Quia Pater naturalis est origo Filii et Spiritus Sancti, ideo totum Patri Filius assignans ait: omnia quae habet Pater, mea sunt; propterea dixi, quia de meo accipiet (Io. XVI. 15)... Si hoc non dixisset, quasi suum esse tantum Spiritum ostendisset; sed dicens, omnia quae habet Pater mea sunt, propterea dixi, quia de meo accipiet, ipsum Spiritum Sanctum unum esse ostendit et Patris et suum... De Filii (al. Filio) ergo accepit, et omnia quae habet Pater, Filii sunt, quae Spiritus Sanctus accepit, quia non de solo Patre nec de solo Filio, sed simul de utroque procedit... Procedere autem de Deo ideo nulla creatura dicitur, ut ille qui procedit de Patre et Filio, sic esse credatur Deus, sicut est Pater et Filius. Solius est enim Spiritus Sancti de Patre et Filio proprietas ista processionis, cuius est cum Patre et Filio natura communis; de Patre quippe et Filio procedit, sed non recedit; nec est in aliquo minor aut subditus, qui de immenso Patre ac de immenso Filio inseparabiliter et unus procedit et totus." Fulgent., contr. Fabian., fragm. XXVII, pp. 612–613.

Although enough has been said about Fulgentius's doctrine in our Treatise (Th. XXXV), let it be noted once more that this very Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspina, is numbered by Macarius in his third and fourth class of Fathers as those who entirely rejected (qui excluent complètement) the procession of the Holy Spirit also from the Son. To persuade his readers in Russia of this, he brings two texts: the first, from the book Contra obiectiones Arianorum (obiect. 10, p. 58), in which—against those who attacked the divinity of the Holy Spirit and thus also His procession from the Father—the Spirit is said to proceed wholly from the Father, which indeed no one but an Arian denies. Yet by that very fact—as we have just heard from Fulgentius—the Spirit "de immenso Patre ac de immenso Filio inseparabiliter et

unus procedit et totus," because "omnia quae habet Pater, Filii sunt" (Vide totum locum Fulgentii in nostro Tractatu, ed. 2, p. 506, nota 2). The second text he adduces (from fragment XXXV contra Fabianum) says—just as in fragment XXVII, a little earlier transcribed by us—"Deum patrem non totius Trinitatis (as Fabian had reproached Fulgentius), sed Filii et Spiritus Sancti fatemur auctorem, de quo habet et unigenitus Filius aeternae nativitatis, et Spiritus Sanctus aeternae processionis originem." Here Macarius breaks off his citation; for there follows a declaration that must be carefully concealed from Russians—Fulgentius's same teaching, as in other places—that, from the very fact the Son is consubstantial with the Father, in the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father the procession from the Son is also to be understood. The words of Fulgentius immediately following, suppressed by the impostor, are these: "Unitas autem naturalis creatorem Filium de creatore Patre naturali nativitate insinuat exstitisse, et creatorem Spiritum Sanctum de Patre Filioque procedere," l.c., p. 652.

First, in that very Second Part of the homilies from which Macarius brings forward a text for his case, one could have read Rabanus's explanation. He teaches most clearly that in the words of Christ, "The Paraclete whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father" (Io. XV. 26), the latter clause is no less to be understood of procession from the Father and the Son than in the former clause the mission is understood not from the Son alone but from the Father and the Son—since (paternity and filiation excepted) the Father and the Son are one in all things. "But when He says, 'He proceeds from the Father,' and immediately adds, 'whom I will send,' He signifies that the same Holy Spirit proceeds equally from the Father and the Son, and is sent equally by the Father and the Son; yet, for the distinction of Persons, He is here said to proceed from the Father and to be sent by the Son (cf. in our Tractate

Th. XIII); and within this same distinction of Persons He declares that His operation and will are one with the will of the Father" (Hom. 49, Migne T. CX, p. 237).

As to his other testimony (from l. VI, c. 2 on Ecclesiastes), let Macarius read the commentary at the beginning of that same chapter 2, which he himself had cited, where Rabanus says thus: "'For my Spirit is sweeter than honey, and my inheritance than honey and the honeycomb.' For this Spirit is none other than the Holy Spirit, who is common to the Father and the Son, because He proceeds from the Father; He also proceeds from the Son; He is sent by the Father; He is sent also by the Son" (ibid., T. CIX, p. 939).

But the Doctor of Mainz should be consulted in those places where of set purpose he hands on the doctrine of the Most Holy Trinity and of the Holy Spirit, such as l. I De Universo, chapter III "On the Holy Spirit," and chapter IV entitled "On the Trinity." There, among many other things, he teaches this: The Holy Spirit is therefore predicated "God," because He proceeds from the Father and the Son and has His [i.e., God's] substance; for nothing else could have proceeded from the Father than what the Father Himself is (78). Moreover, "Spirit" is said according to that which is referred to something. For just as the Father and the Son are called relatively, so in a certain manner the Holy Spirit is said relatively to the Father and the Son, because He is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son... Therefore that gift of God, that is, the Holy Spirit, who proceeds equally from the Father and the Son, is an ineffable communion of the Father and the Son... This is the difference between the Son who is born and the Holy Spirit who proceeds: the Son is born from one; the Holy Spirit proceeds from both... Thus certain things in the

---

78 We saw the same words above in Haymo's homily 106, to whom Rabanus sent his books De Universo, as is clear from the preface to Hemmo.

Trinity are said relatively—such as the Father to the Son, the Son to the Father, and the Holy Spirit relatively to the Father and the Son; but with respect to Himself, whether the Father or the Son or the Holy Spirit, He is called "God" (ibid., T. CXI, pp. 23, 24, 27).

Indeed, in three places in his works, when explaining the very symbol of faith, Rabanus always places among the articles necessarily to be believed the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son. In l. IV De Universo, chapter X, entitled "On the definition of right faith and of ecclesiastical dogmas," the profession runs thus: "We believe one God, Father and Son and Holy Spirit: the Father in that He has a Son; the Son in that He has a Father; the Holy Spirit in that He proceeds from the Father and the Son. The Father, therefore, is the principle of the Godhead [79]... from whom the Son is born; from whom the Holy Spirit [is] not born, because He is not the Son; nor unbegotten, because He is not the Father; nor made, because the Holy Spirit is not from nothing; but He is God proceeding from God the Father and God the Son" (l.c., p. 96).

In De institutione clericorum l. II there is a chapter "On the rule of faith," ch. LVII: "This, moreover, is, after (i.e., according to) the Apostolic Symbol, the most certain faith which our Doctors have handed down: that we should profess the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit of one essence... that we also profess the Father to be unbegotten, the Son the Only-begotten, but the Holy Spirit neither begotten nor unbegotten, but proceeding from the Father and the Son; that the Son proceeds from the Father by being born, but the Holy Spirit by proceeding does not be born" (ibid., T. CVII, p. 369).

---

[79] Here again you have the Catholic explanation of that dictum to which Macarius so absurdly clings.

He repeats the same in the book De sacris ordinibus, chapter IX: "The faith contained in this symbol (80) ought to be so understood by those who are to be baptized, that they believe in God the Father almighty... and in Jesus Christ His Son... And let them believe also in the Holy Spirit, true God, proceeding from the Father and the Son, in all things equal to the Father and the Son" (ibid., T. CXII, p. 1171).

Rabanus, therefore, finds—among ecclesiastical dogmas, in right faith, in the most certain faith handed down by the Fathers, in the faith to be professed in baptism according to the true understanding of the Apostolic Symbol—this truth to be believed even shortly before Photius's first innovation: that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. Yet all this does not prevent Macarius from daring to present this vindicator of the Catholic faith as a witness of a strict negation of the Catholic dogma, and as an assertor of the heresy later introduced by Photius!

Now the same fraud as is committed in the testimonies of Rabanus is perpetrated with the other Fathers whom Macarius, in his three earlier classes, puts forward as asserters of the Photian dogma. From Rabanus as from all the others he adduces—and can adduce—absolutely nothing except that they affirm that the Spirit proceeds from the Father; [that He] proceeds from the Father and is sent by the Son, or remains in the Son; that in the Most Holy Trinity the Father is "origin," "principle of the Godhead." These truths, in which all Catholics agree—and without which the very dogma, in the Catholic sense, of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the First and Second Persons of the Trinity as from one principle could not be conceived—Macarius sells to his pupils as denials of the unity of the

---

80 He means the Apostolic Symbol, of which he had spoken in the preceding chapter VIII.

Father and the Son in spirating and producing the third Person, the Holy Spirit; carefully suppressing those things which, either in the same contexts or elsewhere, the other Fathers—no less than Rabanus—most clearly teach about the unity of the Father and the Son, as in mission so also in the immanent procession of the Holy Spirit, and about the communication of the one spirative power from the generating Father to the begotten Son, by which the third Person of the Most Holy Trinity is produced.

§ IV.
On the Macarian Argument, by Which he Attempts to Prove That By the Affirmation of Procession from the Father the Negation of Procession from the Son is Signified

Our Photius-like author devises a certain argument intended to prove that his testimonies which affirm [procession from the Father] bear an excluding sense, and therefore are rightly taken as though they said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone and not also from the Son. But that an excluding sense could in no way be latent in those testimonies is evident from the contrary doctrine of those same Fathers—unless, perhaps, the Photian party were to say that the holy doctors with the same breath both affirmed and denied the dogma, not knowing either what they were saying or what they were affirming. Yet let us hear the argument, which the adversary sets out in a twofold form.

1º The ancient doctors used to say that the Son is begotten of the Father, nor were they accustomed to add the excluding phrase "begotten of the Father alone"; nevertheless that affirmation is excluding—namely, that He is begotten of the Father alone and not of the Father and the Holy Spirit. Therefore, when they teach that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, the procession from the Father

alone is equally understood, and hence procession from the Son is denied (Macarius, p. 370).

We have already sufficiently refuted this absurd perversion of the whole mystery of the Most Holy Trinity (cf. above, p. 19 ff., and in Treatise, Thesis XXXIII). Since the Father alone is the first Person of the Trinity—which the doctors are accustomed to express by calling the Father alone "unbegotten" (ἀγέννητον) and "the principle of the Godhead"—whereas the Son is the second Person and the Spirit the third; in this immutable sequence of the Persons (ἀκολουθία κατὰ τὴν τάξιν), as Basil calls it (Ep. 38, n. 4; Ep. 125, n. 3), the generation of the Son is presupposed to the procession of the Holy Spirit—not, to be sure, in time, which has no place in eternity, but in order, which there neither is nor can be conceived except in the notion of a principle and of that which has existence from a principle (κατὰ τὸ αἴτιον καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ αἰτίου τὴν ὑπαρξιν ἔχον; Gregory of Nyssa, Contra Eunomium I, I, p. 164; Ad Ablabium, T. II, p. 459; Basil, Ep. 52, n. 2). Hence, just as it is absurd to conceive the first Person as proceeding from the second, while by the very fact that the second Person is and is so called, it is understood as proceeding from the first, so it is altogether equally absurd to conceive the second Person as proceeding from the third, while this latter, by the very fact that it is third in the order of origin, is understood as proceeding from the second, and consequently from the first and the second as from one principle, since (with the sole exception of the mutual relation of Begetter and Begotten) the Father and the Son are one in all things, and by name in spiration (John 16:15). Therefore, from this very fact that the Son is said to be begotten of the Father, it is understood that He does not also proceed from the Holy Spirit, provided the Son is believed to be the second Person and the Spirit the third in the order of origin. But if you overturn this necessary order and presuppose the procession of the Holy Spirit to the generation of the Son, then the

Son, as the third Person—by the very fact that He is said to proceed from the first Person—will necessarily be understood to proceed also from the second Person, who in your perversion would be the Holy Spirit.

Moreover, the Latin Fathers (Augustine, De Trinitate XV, n. 47; Contra Maximinum II, c. 14; In Ioannem, tract. 99, n. 9; Paschasius the deacon, De Spiritu Sancto I, I, c. 12; Isidore of Seville, Etymologiae I, VII, c. 3, n. 8; Rabanus, De Universo I, I, c. 3) teach that by the very name "generation" in the divine mysteries is expressed a procession from one Person alone, and from that it is understood that the procession of the Holy Spirit is not generation, because He proceeds not from one alone but from the Father together with the Son. Likewise, the Greek doctors (Origen, In Ioannem, tom. 2, n. 6; Gregory Thaumaturgus, In symbolo; Basil, Ep. 38 [alt. 43], n. 4; Gregory of Nyssa, Ad Ablabium, T. II, p. 459; Epiphanius, Haer. 73, p. 382) explain the very name "Only-begotten" in such a way that, in comparison with the Holy Spirit, the proper distinguishing notion of the Son is constituted in this: that the Son alone is from the Father alone (μόνος ἐκ μόνου, μόνος μονογενῶς ἐκλάμψας); therefore the Holy Spirit now no longer is from one alone, but proceeds from the Father through the Son.

Finally—and this is the chief point, which Macarius everywhere takes pains to conceal from his readers by suppressing, truncating, and perverting texts—the Fathers, in explaining the Trinity, make clear not only the relation of the Father to the Son, but equally that of the Son to the Holy Spirit, as of principle to the one proceeding from the principle. And therefore as often as they teach that the Son is begotten of the Father, by that very fact they say that He is not begotten also of the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Son Himself; conversely, as often as they affirm the procession of the Spirit from the Father, they not only do not exclude but include the

procession from the Son, since from their manifest doctrine and from the universal faith concerning the economy of the Trinity, the Father and the Son are one in the notion of principle with respect to the third Person who proceeds—as we have abundantly demonstrated.

2º The second argument by which Macarius proves that the affirmation of procession from the Father in the ancient doctors has the force of denying procession from the Son is cobbled together from two falsehoods, one of which is sheer invention from top to bottom, the other perhaps mixed with a crass ignorance of Catholic doctrine. First, he says that the ancient doctors said only that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, and never made any mention of procession from the Son ([81]). Whether you take this as said universally of all the Fathers—as the words suggest—or only of those whom the arguer had enumerated a little earlier, you will find nothing that is not a most egregious falsehood, as the entire Treatise on the Procession of the Holy Spirit and this very little work of ours plainly show. Run through, I beg you, the names of those whom, in the citations immediately preceding, he had adduced and whom he now says never made mention of procession from the Son. Among them he lists Basil, Epiphanius, Cyril of Alexandria, Hilary, Augustine, Paschasius the deacon, Haymo of Halberstadt, and Rabanus of Mainz —whose explicit doctrine we need not rehearse yet again.

In the second part of his argument—which I said is perhaps mingled with a certain gross ignorance—he sets down this enthymeme: If someone among Westerners in our day were to repeat in his writings that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, without naming the Son, he would not escape suspicion—or even

[81] "How is it, then, that they (the ancient pastors) so often say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, without ever making any mention of the Son?" p. 370.

condemnation—of heresy, because now the Western Church believes in procession from the Father and the Son; by contrast, the ancient doctors spoke thus without incurring any blame on the part of the Church; therefore in the ancient Church even procession from the Son was not believed (82).

This has always been the line of argument used against definitions of faith, and it will necessarily always be used by all heretics—except those who dare openly and explicitly to proclaim the fundamental negation implicitly latent in every heresy (as the many Protestant sects do), namely the negation of the ecclesiastical magisterium and thereby of divine tradition understood in its genuine sense. The Artemonites (Eusebius, H.E. V, c. 28), Arians, Macedonians, Nestorians, Eutychians, and Monothelites contended that the faith had anciently been preached in the Church in the way they themselves were speaking: that the ancients said there is one God and that Christ is a man produced by God the Father before the ages, not consubstantial with the Father; that the Holy Spirit, poured out by the Son upon all flesh, is not God from the substance of the Father; that not the Word God was born of the Virgin, for divinity is not born of a mother; not two natures, since Christ is one; not two wills, since there is no contrary will in Christ. They used the same arts of citation, suppression, and interpretation as those which the Photians now employ in striving to persuade their followers that the

82 "If in our days, when the whole Church of the West firmly believes that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, one of her children were to repeat in his writings that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, without mentioning the Son, what would be said of such a writer? Would not his faith be suspect—condemned even? How is it then that, for this same fact, the ancient orthodox in no way incurred the blame of their contemporaries of the same religion?" p. 370.

Holy Spirit's procession from the Father—and nowhere procession from the Son—was what was preached in the ancient Church.

Let us, however, examine Macarius's very argument. In it there are two assertions of fact, both false; and from them a dogmatic conclusion is drawn which, even if the fact were granted, would in no way follow from it.

a) It is false that the ancients said only that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, without either in the same places or elsewhere also expressly explaining that pregnant expression in the sense of procession from the Father and the Son; likewise it is false that Catholics today do not also preach procession from the Father, as though it were always necessary explicitly to name the Son also as the one principle with the Father—except when the opposed heresy, first stirred up by Photius and later welded into a sect in the eleventh century, is in view. The manner of preaching among the ancients is clear from what has been shown, and from the very necessity into which Macarius, like his predecessors, found himself cast—namely, the necessity of truncating and suppressing the testimonies.

b) As for ecclesiastical usage of speech even after the rise of that heresy down to our own age, the adversary might easily have understood the absurdity of his fancy if he had kept before his eyes the words of Jesus Christ in John 15:26 in the Latin, authentic edition of the Catholic Church; if he had considered that the Symbol as defined in the Second Council against the Pneumatomachi, without an explicit declaration of procession from the Son, is even now approved by the Catholic Church, and that after the declaration of its genuine sense it was permitted to Catholic Greeks without any difficulty in the Councils of Lyons and Florence; and finally (not to say anything of the writings of theologians), if he had at least read the Latin liturgy in the feasts of Pentecost. In the Mass of Tuesday the Communion, and on Thursday the antiphon at the Magnificat,

express procession from the Father: "Spiritus qui a Patre procedit, alleluia." In the prayer of Wednesday the whole Church prays: "Mentes nostras, quaesumus Domine, Paraclitus qui a te procedit, illuminet et inducat in omnem, sicut tuus promisit Filius, veritatem." And this prayer is repeated daily by all bishops and priests in their preparation for celebrating the Sacrifice of the Mass.

c) But let us grant Macarius his hypothesis for a moment, although both its parts are false. What, pray, could be inferred? Only what Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Epiphanius, the Fathers of Chalcedon, Jerome, Augustine, Vincent of Lérins, in passages often cited and very well known, have taught: that indeed, after the Apostles, there is no increase of the Catholic revelation itself; nevertheless, there has been and can be progress in the explanation, declaration, and more insistent preaching of individual dogmas. Indeed, new heresies have almost always furnished the occasion and brought the necessity for such more distinct declarations. "Many things lay hidden in the Scriptures; and when heretics were cut off, they stirred the Church of God with questions; what lay hidden came to light, and the will of God was understood... Therefore many who could most excellently discern and handle the Scriptures lay hidden among the people of God, nor did they assert the solution of difficult questions when no calumniator pressed them. For was the Trinity treated perfectly before the Arians barked?" Augustine, In Ps. 54, n. 22; De civitate Dei XVI, c. 2, n. 1; De dono perseverantiae, n. 53; Confessiones VII, c. 19, n. 25; Jerome, Contra Rufinum II, n. 17; Basil, Ep. 123 [alt. 78], n. 3; Nazianzen, Ep. 2 ad Cledonium, T. II, p. 94; Epiphanius, Haer. 74, n. 14, p. 904; Fathers of Chalcedon, Allocutio ad Marcianum Augustum (Mansi VII, p. 458 f.); Vincent of Lérins, Commonitorium, nn. 22–23. Whoever were to deny this progress of preaching would thereby subvert the Church's magisterium in its genuine meaning, and would call into manifest

jeopardy the guardianship of the true sense of revealed dogmas and their defense against manifold and mutually diverse errors, as that guardianship was promised and committed by Christ to the Church (see Treatise De Traditione, sect. IV).

If, then, the distinction asserted by Macarius between the manner of speaking in the Catholic Church before and after Photian times were true, one would have to say that the doctrine which is expressed in the Scriptures themselves was always preserved and believed in the Church—namely, that the Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son; that He proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son; that He is sent by the Father and the Son; that the Son is one with the Father in all things and is distinguished from Him only by the sole relation of begotten Son and unbegotten Father; that in the order of origin the Holy Spirit is the third Person in relation to the Son as the second Person; and that the consubstantial Persons of the Trinity are distinguished among themselves only by the relation of principle and of the one proceeding from the principle. In this profession, to be sure, it is contained equivalently that the Holy Spirit, as the third Person, proceeds from the Father and the Son (the first and the second Persons), insofar as They are one in spiration, and not from the Father alone—since by spiration the Father is not distinguished from the Son, because He is not referred by spiration to the Son. The Fathers could, then, have been content with this equivalent doctrine, in which at least implicitly the faith in procession from both was contained, so long as "the question concerning the mode of procession had not yet been raised," and "no calumniator was pressing"; all the more because in that age the whole contention and force of the arguments against the Arians had to be directed to the defense of the divinity of the Holy Spirit and therefore of His procession from the substance of the Father, which the heretics directly attacked. Thus concerning the very consubstantiality of the

Son with the Father—and even for somewhat longer concerning the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit—at earlier times, before the question was stirred up by the Arians and Macedonians, the Fathers' preaching was far less explicit and less solicitous than after "heretics stirred the Church of God by questions." Indeed, as Jerome observes (loc. cit.), before there arose in Alexandria, as it were, a noonday demon—Arius—some spoke innocently and less cautiously, and in ways that could not avert the calumny of perverse men. If, then, before the rise of the Byzantine demon there were similar difficulties in some of the ancient doctors regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, we would have nothing contrary to the dogma itself, but would have that mode of speaking and disputing which is customary in most dogmas before their explicit definition and before the necessity of polemical defense. In reality, however, those less cautious expressions, which are found in great number prior to the explanation of consubstantiality framed against the Arians, do not occur at all with respect to the dogma of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, even for that earlier stage of simple faith before the necessary defense against the Photians—in the writings of the orthodox Fathers—if you except (as we have already observed elsewhere) a certain particular way of speaking in SS. Maximus and John of Damascus, which has the easiest solution from these very doctors and from other Fathers.

§ V.

A Compendium of Catholic Doctrine in the Principal Greek Fathers Who are Cited in Favor of the Photian Doctrine

In his fourth class, Macarius, after so many empty shifts, finally promises us testimonies by which the procession from the Son

is excluded, either explicitly or at least by an equivalent sense of the words, absolutely and entirely ([83]).

But it is enough to have read the names of the Fathers whom he brings forward for this thesis of his, to understand at once the absurdity of the calumny. For he cites those very Greek and Latin doctors who not in one or two places only but frequently, and throughout their doctrine on the internal relations of the divine Persons, most clearly explained the Catholic dogma—among the Greeks, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, Cyril of Alexandria; among the Latins, Augustine, Vigilius of Tapsus, Fulgentius. Yet the audacity with which the impostor mocks his readers surpasses all belief, if one inspects the very citations of the testimonies. Even if the texts of all these Fathers were admitted as he adduces them—bracketing out the explicit explanations often given by the same doctors in other places—nothing else would finally be found in them than the very thing which has already been said and said again in Macarius's first three classes of testimonies, and without which the Catholic dogma in its genuine sense could not stand: namely, these Fathers say in this fourth class, as in the previous three, this one and only thing—that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and that the Father is the principle or cause of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, because Macarius affirms that in this fourth class of his there are finally decisive testimonies which exclude the procession from the Son—expressly or at least equivalently (in the sense, to be sure, of the Catholic dogma, by which we believe the unbegotten Father and the consubstantial begotten Son to be one principle of the third Person)—let us look again at their doctrine.

---

[83] "There finally exist testimonies which, in recognizing the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Father, exclude completely—either by their sense or even to the letter—the idea that He proceeds likewise from the Son." p. 381.

The doctrine of the Greek Fathers—Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, Cyril—concerning the procession of the Spirit, we have seen to be most manifest not in one or two isolated texts only but in the whole exposition of the mystery of the Trinity (Theses XXXII, n. II; XXXIII; XXXV, n. III; XXXVI; XXXVII).

1º Basil declares that the Spirit, third in order in the Most Holy Trinity, depends upon the Father and the Son; that He shines forth from the Father through the Son as the Spirit of the Son and the mind of Christ; so that the mystery remains impenetrable—why the Spirit is not the Son of the Son; that essential holiness and all perfections are communicated from the Father through the Only-begotten to the Holy Spirit; that the phrases "from the Father through the Son," drawn from the Scriptures, indicate both the unity of Father and Son in relation to that term which is said to be "from the Father through the Son," and nevertheless designate the Father as the primordial cause (προκαταρκτικήν αἰτίαν). What he calls (De Spiritu Sancto, n. 20) προκαταρκτικήν αἰτίαν, elsewhere he calls τὴν πρώτην αἰτίαν, at the same time explaining how, on account of the origin of the Son from the Father, there are not two causes when the Father is said to act through the Son. "Even according to us," he says, "all things are through the Son, since the divine will, going forth from the First Cause as from a fountain (οἷον πηγῆς τινος τῆς πρώτης αἰτίας ἀφορμηθέν τὸ θεῖον βούλημα), advances to activity through its Image, God the Word (πρόεισιν εἰς ἐνέργειαν)." Contra Eunomium II, n. 21. "Now who does not see that no action of the Son is separated from the Father, nor is there anything among beings which should be attributed to the Son and alienated from the Father? For 'all mine are thine, and thine are mine' (John 17:10). How then," he says, "does Eunomius attribute the cause of the Spirit to the Only-begotten alone (τοῦ πνεύματος τὴν αἰτίαν τῷ μονογενεῖ μόνῳ προστίθησι), and, as it were, take the creation of the Holy Spirit as a predicate of His nature?

If, in saying this, he introduces two mutually opposed principles (the Father and the Son), he will be crushed together with Manichaeus and Marcion; but if he refers the existence of all things to one principle, then that which is said to have been done by the Son is referred to the First Cause (πρὸς τὴν πρώτην αἰτίαν ἀναφορὰν ἔχει). Wherefore, even though we believe that all things have been brought into existence through God the Word, nevertheless we do not deny that God (the Father) is the cause of all things (τὸ πάντων αἴτιον εἶναι τὸν θεὸν τῶν ὅλων)" (84). "But how is it not manifestly perilous to sever the Spirit from God (ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ), when partly the Apostle hands it down to us conjointly (συνημμένως—i.e., conjointly the relation to the Father and to the Son), and now calls Him the Spirit of Christ, now the Spirit of God, where he writes, 'If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ' (Rom 8:9), and again, 'you have received the Spirit who is from God' (1 Cor 2:12); and partly the Lord calls Him the Spirit of truth—since He Himself (the Lord) is the Truth—and (likewise says) that He proceeds from the Father (John 15:26). But this fellow (Eunomius), to the destruction of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, takes the Spirit away from the Father and assigns Him separately (διαφερόντως) to the Only-begotten, to the overthrow of

84 Here again you see the holy doctors, when they regard the relation of the begetting Father to the begotten Son, taking τὸ αἴτιον in the same signification in which they say τὴν πρώτην αἰτίαν and προκαταρκτικὴν αἰτίαν; and consequently this notion—both in the works ad extra and in the production of the Holy Spirit—is proper to the First Person alone. Therefore, in this signification, St. Maximus very rightly said that Catholics teach the procession of the Spirit "through the Son," and yet nevertheless confess the Father alone as αἴτιον of that same Spirit.

glory" (85). To be compared with these are those places of Basil in which he teaches that such is the relation of the Spirit to the Son as is the relation of the Son to the Father (Thesis XXXIII, n. I), to which

---

85 Πῶς δὲ οὐ φανερὸν ἔχει τὸν κίνδυνον διαιρεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα; τοῦτο μὲν τοῦ ᾽Αποστόλου συνημμένως ἡμῖν παραδιδόντος, καὶ νῦν μὲν Χριστοῦ λέγοντος, νῦν δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν οἷς γράφει, εἰ δὲ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ πάλιν, ὑμεῖς δὲ... ἐλάβετε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ· τοῦτο δὲ τοῦ κυρίου τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας λέγοντος, ἐπειδὴ αὐτὸς (scilicet ὁ κύριος, not τὸ πνεῦμα, as the editor Maurinus supposed, who did not rightly interpret this whole period) ἡ ἀλήθεια, καὶ (scilicet πάλιν λέγοντος) παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται. ᾽Αλλ᾽ οὗτος... ἀφαιρεῖ μὲν αὐτὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, τῷ δὲ μονογενεῖ διαφερόντως προστίθησι. — Many things in these words of Basil are especially worthy of note. (a) To "sever the Spirit from God" signifies to sever Him from the Father and the Son: therefore, when in the Scriptures it is simply said "the Spirit of God," "the Spirit from God" is understood as the Spirit of the Father and of the Son—from the Father and the Son (see Thesis XXXII, n. II). (b) As other Fathers (whom I have described loc. cit.) treat as quasi-synonyms the two phrases "to be the Spirit of the Father and of the Son" and "to proceed from the Father and the Son," so this same equivalence is taken for granted in Basil. For to prove that the Holy Spirit is called in the Scriptures the Spirit of the Father, he adduces these two texts: "the Spirit who is from God," "who proceeds from the Father"; therefore in one and the same context he brings forward two other testimonies, which signify the origin relative to the Son, where He is called the Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of truth (i.e., of the Son). (c) It is Eunomian to say that the Spirit is referred "differently" (διαφερόντως) to the Son than to the Father; hence the Catholic profession is that the Holy Spirit's relation to the Father and to the Son is one and the same. (d) This is said yet more distinctly in Basil's immediately preceding words, which we quoted. He argues thus: When Eunomius says that the Spirit is "from the Son alone" and not "also from the Father," either he posits the Father and the Son as two principles opposed to one another—and so falls into the heresy of the Manichees—or he confesses

we must also join the celebrated testimony (Contra Eunomium III, n. 1), in which even the Photians cannot deny that the Catholic doctrine is expressed. For this reason they have tried to corrupt it in later manuscripts by truncating and interpolating it—an adulteration which has been fully demonstrated by many very weighty men from the authority of ancient codices and from internal arguments (Thesis XXXV).

2º Gregory of Nyssa, Basil's brother, repeats the same things and even more forcefully. He says that just as the Son is joined to the Father, having His being from Him, yet is not later in existence than the Father, so in turn the Holy Spirit depends upon the Son, so that the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit is presupposed to the Son—not indeed in time, but according to the notion of principle 1). The Son and the Spirit are both from the Father as from a principle; but in the procession of the one and of the other this is the difference: the Son is immediately from the Father; the Spirit, however, is from the First through the Second Person; and this very fact—that the Son stands in the middle between the Father and the Holy Spirit—brings it about that the Son alone is from the Father alone, and yet the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father is not taken away (86) (for the Spirit proceeds from the Father, not, however, from the Father alone, but from the Father through the Son).

Gregory explains again, in the celebrated place Sermon III on the Lord's Prayer—which, together with the vindications of Beccus and Cardinal Mai, I cited in Thesis XXXV—this difference in procession, namely that the Son, as Only-begotten, is begotten of the

---

86 Τοῦ ἐξ αἰτίας ὄντος πάλιν ἄλλην διαφορὰν ἐννοοῦμεν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου, τὸ δὲ διὰ τοῦ προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου, ὥστε καὶ τὸ μονογενὲς ἀναμφίβολον ἐπὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ μένειν, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ ἀμφιβάλλειν, τῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ μεσιτείας καὶ αὐτῷ τὸ μονογενὲς φυλαττούσης, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς φυσικῆς πρὸς τὸν πατέρα σχέσεως μὴ ἀπειργούσης.

Father alone ([87]), whereas the Holy Spirit is taught in the Scriptures not to proceed from the Father alone, but from the Father and from the Son as well—since, by a personal name and therefore relatively, He is called not only the Spirit of the Father but also the Spirit of the Son. Let it be noted that the very corruption perpetrated by the schismatics did not reach so far as to abolish Gregory's doctrine: for as regards the substance of the point, the same meaning remains even in that corrupted reading; when the impostors themselves began to realize this, they ultimately attempted, in the copying of manuscripts, to suppress the entire passage (so that in the printed editions and in two more recent Vatican codices the whole period is omitted). See Cardinal Mai, Nova Bibliotheca Patrum, pp. 40 ff. In the genuine reading, concerning which—especially after the demonstrations of Cardinal Angelo Mai—every doubt has been removed, the Photians themselves are forced to acknowledge the Catholic doctrine. "Since it is common to the Son and to the Holy Spirit that they do not subsist ἀγεννήτως, nevertheless there is one and another property distinguishing each. For the Only-begotten Son is said by Holy Scripture to be from the Father, and at this point the sacred doctrine establishes His property; but the Holy Spirit is said both to be from the Father and is confirmed by testimony to be from the Son as well. For 'if anyone,' he says (the Apostle), 'does not have the Spirit of

[87] As Gregory of Nyssa, so also other Fathers (Origen, In Ioannem, tom. 2, n. 6; Gregory Thaumaturgus, In symbolo; Basil, Ep. 38 [alt. 43], n. 4; Meletius in Epiphanius, Haer. 73, n. 30, p. 878) explain the name "Only-begotten," not indeed from its etymology, but from a dogma learned elsewhere—namely, that, in comparison with the Holy Spirit, the Son alone proceeds from the Father alone (μόνος μονογενῶς ἐκλάμψας). A far different is the heretical explanation of the Eunomians, who said that He is "Only-begotten" because He alone was begotten and created—not because He alone was begotten (Basil, Contra Eunomium II, n. 21).

Christ, he is not His'" ([88]). Already in Thesis XXXII, n. II, and elsewhere in this very appendix, we have shown that "Spirit," as a personal name, is always taken relatively to another Person from whom He is spirated. Hence we have seen that both the Greek and Latin Fathers prove the origin of the Spirit—whether from the Father or from the Son—from the fact that in the Scriptures He is called now the Spirit of the Father, now the Spirit of the Son; in agreement with these, Gregory most rightly adduces, to confirm the procession from the Son, that testimony of the Apostle in which He is called the Spirit of Christ.

But let us concede to the schismatics the reading in which, in the second clause, they corrupted Ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ by expunging the particle Ἐκ. On this hypothesis, the same thing would still be said in other words altogether. Gregory seeks the character proper to each Person and constituting each as distinct. Such a character cannot be that which is absolute and therefore common to all the Persons (as consubstantiality or unity of nature), nor can it be a mere work ad extra (as, in the Photian view—however absurdly conceived—the mission of a Person); rather, the distinguishing and constituting property must necessarily be understood as the internal relation of one Person to another. Now let us inspect Gregory's doctrine in the reading we have allowed. He says that what is proper to the Father alone, and not common to the Son and the Holy Spirit, is to be without a principle of Himself (τὸ ἄνευ αἰτίας εἶναι μόνου τοῦ πατρός). But it is not enough to distinguish the Father as without a principle from the One who proceeds from a principle; we must also find the personal property by which the Son and the Spirit are distinguished

[88] Ὁ γὰρ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς παρὰ τῆς ἁγίας γραφῆς ὀνομάζεται, καὶ μέχρι τούτου ὁ λόγος ἵστησιν αὐτῷ τὸ ἰδίωμα· τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς λέγεται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ εἶναι προσμαρτυρεῖται· εἰ γὰρ τις, φησί, πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ.

from one another (πάλιν ἐστὶν ἄμικτον τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἰδιώμασιν αὐτῶν διαφορὰν ἐξευρεῖν). It is not enough to say that the Son is from the Father and that the Holy Spirit is from the Father; for this is not distinguishing between them but stating a common predicate for both (κοινοῦ δὲ ὄντος τῷ υἱῷ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τὸ μὴ ἀγεννήτως εἶναι). Therefore, we must preserve this common element intact, but at the same time show the difference by which, in divine revelation, the Son is said to be "from the Father" and the Holy Spirit is said to be "from the Father," and this diversity of origin in the one and the other will constitute the distinguishing property, "so that both the common element (to be from the Father) is preserved and the proper [property] (the mode of origin proper to each) is not confused." Thus far even the Photians will say that they agree with Gregory and with Catholic doctrine; but now comes the very point about which alone there is question—namely, wherein that difference of origin consists. The Photians say that the difference of origin lies in this: that the Son is generated by the Father alone, the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone. Gregory grants the first and expressly denies the second. Seeing that a merely different sound of the words "generation" and "procession" does not suffice, but that the distinction must be sought in the very internal relation of the Spirit and the Son—and that there would be no such distinction if each had origin from the Father alone —the holy doctor does not even employ the word "procession" to declare the distinction; rather, he seeks only how "to be from the Father" differs in the Son and in the Holy Spirit. He teaches that this difference is that in divine revelation the Only-begotten Son is said to be from the Father alone—and this is His whole constituting property (ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς παρὰ τῆς ἁγίας γραφῆς ὀνομάζεται, καὶ μέχρι τούτου ὁ λόγος ἵστησιν αὐτῷ τὸ ἰδίωμα)—whereas the Spirit is not said to be from the Father alone; for this would not distinguish Him from the Son, since exactly the same notion would

be enunciated by saying "the Son is from the Father" and "the Spirit is from the Father." Rather, the relation of origin—one and most simple—which distinguishes the Holy Spirit from the Son is declared in the Scriptures by a complex proposition: that He is said to be both from the Father and "of the Son" (καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς λέγεται καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ εἶναι προσμαρτυρεῖται). From Gregory's very explicit doctrine, therefore, the relation of origin of the Holy Spirit—the only relation distinguishing Him from the Son—is this: that He is the Spirit of the Son. But to say that the relation of origin by which the Holy Spirit is constituted as a Person distinct from the Son is expressed in the Scriptures by the appellation "Spirit of the Son" plainly means that the name "Spirit" in the Scriptures is relative (spirated), expressing origin from that Person of whom He is said to be the Spirit; therefore the name "Spirit of the Son" expresses the origin of the Holy Spirit from the Son—and so in such wise that by this origin alone He is distinguished from the Son, and consequently, if it be denied, the very distinction of the Spirit from the Son is denied.

3º Epiphanius's constant and most explicit doctrine we have set out in our Treatise (Thesis XXXV). Both in the Ancoratus and in Heresy LXXIV—which is that of the Pneumatomachi, who taught that the Holy Spirit is not from the Father, but is created by the Son—Epiphanius, like the other Fathers contending against these heretics, had it as his direct aim to demonstrate the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Now for this demonstration, and to exclude the creation of the Spirit by the Son in the Photian sense, the necessary and evident argument would have been the negation of the Holy Spirit's origin from the Son. For those who think with the Photians must find in the doctrine of those Pneumatomachi three errors: that they affirmed the Spirit to be from the Son; that they denied Him to be from the Father; that they taught Him to be from the Son by creation. These three errors taken together could be refuted by no

other argument—and all three together would have been torn up root and branch, from the mind of the Pneumatomachi—than if it were shown that the Spirit does not have origin from the Son. For, this once posited, the Pneumatomachi would certainly have been convicted that the Spirit is not one of the creatures, all of which they conceded and insisted are from the Son, continually appealing in support of their heresy concerning the creation of the Holy Spirit to that text: "omnia per ipsum facta sunt." Moreover, since they likewise conceded and held it indubitable that the Spirit is a hypostasis not from Himself but from Another, by the same argument it would have been established that, since on the hypothesis He is not from the Son, the Spirit is from the Father. But none of the orthodox Fathers—much less Epiphanius—ever used such an argument or anything like it. Rather, just as Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril, and the others did, so Epiphanius most luminously not only concedes but repeats and insists that the Spirit is indeed from the Son; and from this very fact—that He is from the Son—he demonstrates that He is likewise from the Father, since all that is the Son's is the Father's and has been communicated to the Son by the Father; further, that the Spirit is from the Father not by creation but from the essence of the Father, and therefore that in the same way He is from the Son, from the essence of the Son—from the Father and the Son, from both. He teaches, namely, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ (Ancoratus, n. 7); ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ (ibid., n. 8); παρὰ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ (ibid., n. 71); ἀπὸ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ (ibid., n. 72); παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ (Haer. 84, n. 10); παρ' ἀμφοτέρων (ibid., n. 7); ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων (Ancoratus, n. 67).

4º Cyril likewise not only enunciates the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as from the Father, but in many ways declares and elucidates it. I have set out Cyril's doctrine in his own words in the Treatise. "He (the Son) calls the Spirit of truth, that is,

His own, the Paraclete. For the Holy Spirit is in no way understood as alien from the essence of the Only-begotten, but naturally proceeds from it, being, as to identity of nature, nothing other than He, although otherwise He is understood as subsisting in His own right… Since," says the Son, "the Spirit is mine, and as it were my mind, assuredly He will speak what are in me… This will be a sign for you—that surely the Spirit is from my substance, and as it were my mind—that He will proclaim the things to come, just as I do. For He would not foretell the future as I do unless He were in me and proceeded through me (89), and were consubstantial with me… Since the Spirit is consubstantial with the Son, and in a mode befitting God He

89 δι᾽ ἐμοῦ προϊόν; and a little below, πρόεισι θεοπρεπῶς δι᾽ αὐτοῦ (υἱοῦ); and προϊόν δι᾽ αὐτοῦ φυσικῶς; and πνεῦμα τὸ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ. These clearly state procession "through the Son" by the communication of nature from the Son, as is clear from the added explanations: "from the substance of the Son He naturally proceeds"; "through the Son He naturally proceeds," "receiving all the things that are the Son's"; "from the Father and the Son He receives what are Theirs." In this same context, procession "from the Father" is expressed by the same words—save that of the Father as primordial principle it is said ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, and of the begotten Son, διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ—whose signification we have explained elsewhere (Thesis XXXVI). Yet, lest even here the Photians find room for caviling, Cyril speaks of the Father in exactly the same way as he speaks of the Son: τὸ ἴδιον πνεῦμα, ἐξ αὐτοῦ προϊόν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐξ οὗπερ ἔστι; and, likewise of the Son: τὸ ἴδιον αὐτοῦ (τοῦ υἱοῦ) καὶ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ κατὰ φύσιν προχεόμενον πνεῦμα (In Ioannem, p. 126); παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, ὅλην ἔχον αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνέργειαν (Dialogi de Trinitate V, p. 598); ᾗ μὲν ἔστι θεὸς καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ὁ υἱός, ἴδιον αὐτοῦ τε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστι, καθάπερ ἀμέλει καὶ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῦ νοεῖται τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός (In Joel, T. III, p. 228); ὅτι τοίνυν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐν ἡμῖν γενόμενον συμμόρφους ἀποδεικνύει θεοῦ, πρόεισι δὲ καὶ ἐκ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ, πρόδηλον ὅτι τῆς θείας ἐστὶν οὐσίας, οὐσιωδῶς ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς προϊόν (Thesaurus, p. 345).

proceeds through Him, having His most perfect efficacy and power in all things, on that account He says, 'for He will take of mine.' We believe indeed that the Spirit subsists in His own right... but existing in the essence of God, He springs forth and proceeds from it, having naturally in Himself all the things that are His... It is therefore entirely without reproach to say that the Spirit receives from the Only-begotten what is His. For as His own Spirit, proceeding naturally through Him, together with all that He perfectly has (with the absolute attributes), He is said to receive the things that are the Son's." There follows then a lengthy declaration of the procession of the Son from the substance of the Father, such that the Son is consubstantial with the Father and that all things that are the Father's are the Son's, except "to be Father" (δίχα μόνον τοῦ εἶναι πατέρα). "Now God and Father has from Himself and in Himself His own Spirit, namely the Holy Spirit... who is essentially in Him and proceeds from Him indivisibly and inseparably, and as His own declares the things that are His, in whom and from whom He is. But this Spirit is also proper to the Only-begotten, for the Son is consubstantial with the Father (90)... Thus, we say that the Spirit receives from the Father and the Son the things that are Theirs—not as though at some time He did not have the wisdom and power which are in them, and then at length began to have them when He is thought to receive—but as a good fragrance, living and efficacious, is from the very essence [of God]. Therefore, since the Son is the fruit and character of the subsistence of the Begetter, He claims by nature

90 Earlier in this very commentary, p. 810, he had said: "The Son, being essentially a sharer (οὐσιωδῶς κοινωνός) in the natural goods of God and Father, has the Spirit in the same way in which the Father is understood to have Him... By breathing corporeally, Christ showed that from the divine essence—fittingly to God—there proceeds the Spirit who is from Himself (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ)."

as His own all the things that are His. Hence He says: 'All things that the Father has are mine; therefore I said to you that He will take of mine and will declare it to you'—namely the Spirit who is through Him and in Him, by whom (the Son) indwells the saints just as the Father does." Cyril, In Ioannem, T. IV, pp. 925–932.

Note: Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, τοῦτ᾽ ἐστιν ἑαυτοῦ, τὸν παράκλητον ἀποκαλεῖ (ὁ υἱός). Οὐ γὰρ ἀλλότριον τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ μονογενοῦς τὸ ἅγιον νοεῖται πνεῦμα, πρόεισι δὲ φυσικῶς ἐξ αὐτῆς, οὐδὲν ἕτερον παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχον, ὅσον εἰς ταυτότητα φύσεως, εἰ καὶ νοοῖτο τυχὸν ἰδιοσυστάτως... Ἐπειδὴ δὲ πνεῦμα καὶ οἱονεὶ νοῦς ἐστιν ἐμός, λαλήσει δὴ πάντως τὰ ἐν ἐμοί... Σημεῖον τοῦτο ἔσται ὑμῖν, ὅτι δὴ πάντως ἐκ τῆς ἐμῆς οὐσίας τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστι καὶ οἷον ἐμός ἐστι νοῦς, τὸ ἐμείν αὐτὸν τὰ ἐσόμενα, καθάπερ ἐγώ... Οὐκ οὖν ἄρα, καθάπερ ἐγώ, προερεῖ τὰ ἐσόμενα, μὴ οὐχὶ πάντως ἐν ἐμοί τε ὑπάρχον, καὶ δι᾽ ἐμοῦ προϊόν, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας ὑπάρχον ἐμοί... Ἐπειδὴ δὴ (τὸ πνεῦμα) ὁμοούσιον τὸ ἐστι τῷ υἱῷ, καὶ πρόεισι θεοπρεπῶς δι᾽ αὐτοῦ πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐφ᾽ ἅπασι τελεωτάτην ἔχον ἐνέργειάν τε καὶ δύναμιν, διὰ τοῦτο φησὶν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται. Ὑφεστάναι γὰρ αὐτὸ καθ᾽ ἑαυτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα πιστεύομεν... ἐνυπάρχον γε μὴν τῇ οὐσίᾳ θεοῦ, προκύπτει τε καὶ πρόεισι ἐξ αὐτῆς, πάντα τὰ αὐτῆς ἔχον ἐν ἑαυτῷ φυσικῶς... Ἀκαταγόρητον οὖν ἄρα παντελῶς, καὶ λοιδορίας ἀπάσης ἔξω κείσεται, τὸ λαβεῖν λέγεσθαί τι παρὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ· προϊὸν γὰρ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ φυσικῶς, ὡς ἴδιον αὐτοῦ, μετὰ πάντων ὧν ἔχει τελείως, λαμβάνειν λέγεται τὰ αὐτοῦ... Ἔχει τοίνυν ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ τε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἴδιον πνεῦμα, τοῦτ᾽ ἐστι τὸ ἅγιον, δι᾽ οὗ τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐναυλίζεται... ἐν αὐτῷ τε ὄντος οὐσιωδῶς, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ προϊόντος ἀμερίστως τε καὶ ἀδιαστάτως, ὡς ἰδιά τε διερμηνεύοντος τὰ ἐν καὶ ἐξ οὗπερ ἔστιν... ἀλλ᾽ ἴδιον πνεῦμα τοῦτ᾽ ἐστι καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς, ὁμοούσιος γάρ ἐστι τῷ πατρί... Λαμβάνειν τε οὕτω τὸ πνεῦμα φαμεν ἔκ τε τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὰ αὐτῶν, οὐχ ὡς ποτε μὲν οὐκ ἔχον τὴν ἔνουσαν αὐτοῖς γνῶσίν τε καὶ δύναμιν, ἔχον δὲ τότε μόλις, ὅταν νοῆται λαμβάνον... Ὥσπερ δ᾽ ἂν φῶμεν τὴν ἐκ τῶν ἀρωμάτων

εὐωδίαν... τοιοῦτόν τε μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦτο νοήσεις ἐπὶ τε θεοῦ (ex antecedentibus: τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ) καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος· οἷονεὶ γὰρ ὀσμὴ τις ἐστι τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ, ζῶσά τε καὶ ἐναργής... Καρπὸς οὖν ἄρα καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ γεννήσαντος ὑπάρχων ὁ υἱός, πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ἐπάγεται· διὰ τοῦτο φησιν, Πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατήρ, ἐμὰ ἐστι· διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν (note "receives" in the present, "will announce" in the future), τὸ πνεῦμα δηλονότι τὸ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ, δι᾽ οὗ τοῖς ἁγίοις ὡς αὐτὸς ἐνοικεῖ.

For my part, I do not know with what clearer words the Catholic doctrine could be presented and explained than we see it here—and in two other places as well, some of which we cited in the Treatise—by Cyril. (a) By the same words with which it is said that the Spirit is "from the Father," that He "proceeds" (προϊέναι) from the Father, "from the essence of the Father," it is at the same time taught that in the same way He also is and naturally (in His divine nature) proceeds "through the Son" and "from the Son," "from the essence of the Son." (b) This procession "through the Son" and "from the Son" is declared, namely, what it is: that the Spirit has received the whole divine perfection from the Son; just as the Son is the Word (ὁ λόγος) of the Father, so the Spirit is the mind or Word (ὁ νοῦς) of the Son. (c) Hence Cyril further explains that the procession and reception of all perfections from the Son as from the Father do not begin in time, but are eternal; and that from this same procession—through the reception of the essence of the Father and of the Son, from the Father and the Son—there follows the consubstantiality of the Spirit with the Father and the Son. (d) Moreover, Cyril most rightly teaches that the communication of the whole perfection from the Son, as from the Father, to the Holy Spirit must necessarily be believed from the very fact that the Son is consubstantial with the Father and has all that is the Father's, except the sole formal notion of paternity. (e) Just as to

say that the Spirit is "proper to the Father" (πνεῦμα ἴδιον τοῦ πατρός) signifies nothing other than that the Father has the Spirit in Himself and proceeding from Himself (an immanent procession), so in exactly the same sense the Spirit is said to be "proper to the Son" (πνεῦμα ἴδιον τοῦ υἱοῦ). Therefore, as often as in the Scriptures He is called the Spirit of the Son, the Spirit of truth; and likewise where He is said to receive from the Son, to hear from the Son—so often, according to Cyril, the eternal immanent procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son in the unity of nature is to be understood.

§ VI.
The Testimonies Adduced by Macarius from These Same Fathers are Examined

To this doctrine of the Fathers—which we have described and which, as Epiphanius (haer. 74, n. 8) calls it, is constant, lucid, illuminating, and understood by the saints through faith—what testimonies, at last, will an adversary ever be able to set in opposition, in order to persuade even people at the ends of the earth of his thesis that these Fathers absolutely denied the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son (ils l'excluent complètement)?

1° And from Basil he brings forward two texts which not only do not "absolutely deny," as he says, but—when compared with the whole doctrine of Basil—affirm the procession from the Son, provided they are not perverted by a false interpretation, as Macarius has done.

a) He sets out the passage of Basil, Ep. 38 (al. 43), n. 4, which in Macarius's version reads as follows: "Insofar as the Holy Spirit is

joined to the Son (est uni au Fils) (91), from whom He appears inseparable, He has His being from His author, the Father (de son auteur, le Père) (92), from whom He proceeds; the distinctive character of His hypostatic attribute is to be known after the Son and with the Son, and to have existence from the Father: but the Son, who Himself and with Himself makes known (fait connaître) (93) the Spirit who proceeds from the Father, since He alone and only has come forth (étant sorti seul et unique) (94) resplendent from the bosom of the unbegotten light, has nothing in common, by His distinguishing characteristics, with the Father and the Holy Spirit."

Even if this version be admitted, not even an Oedipus could conjecture in what words our Photius has found a complete denial of procession from the Son, since he himself does not indicate it. The words of Basil (if they really read so) would indeed affirm the procession from the Father (about which there is no doubt); as for the procession then from the Son, which the holy Doctor most clearly

---

91 I will underline the principal fallacies in Macarius's version. The Greek here has τοῦ υἱοῦ μὲν ἤρτηται, which does not mean "united in any way whatsoever," but "depends upon another," in precisely the same sense in which it is soon said that the Spirit has τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξημμένον τὸ εἶναι. Now a "dependence" of one divine Person upon another cannot be conceived as anything other than origin. Macarius himself, if he understands the Greek words, will admit that one cannot possibly say ὁ πατὴρ ἤρτηται τοῦ υἱοῦ, but only, in the inverse order, ὁ υἱὸς ἤρτηται τοῦ πατρός.

92 Basil says τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς αἰτίας—the same which a little earlier he called τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ἁπάντων τῶν ὄντων αἰτίας, namely the primordial principle: from whom is the Son, and through the Son the Holy Spirit.

93 What Basil calls γνωρίζειν, in the divine Persons is an immanent γνώρισμα, of which I shall speak presently.

94 In Greek μόνος μονογενῶς ἐκλάμψας—which is far different from what Macarius says.

vindicates elsewhere, they not only would not deny it, but—though more obscurely—would sufficiently indicate it in harmony with the rest of his teaching. But if the very words of Basil, as they in fact read, and the entire discussion in that number 4 of Ep. 38 are examined, this passage is discovered to be one of those in which the procession of the third Person from the second as from the first is most clearly presented as an essential, interior element of the economy of the Most Holy Trinity.

He explains there how the three Persons, though one with the nature, are nevertheless really distinguished from one another by personal characters. "The Holy Spirit," he says, "is said in Scripture to effect all things; yet this operation and this power are in the Spirit from the Son; nor must we stop here, but we must come to the unbegotten cause, namely to the Father, from whom the same operation and power are in the Son and in the Holy Spirit"—in the sense that Gregory of Nyssa, Basil's brother and the recipient of this letter, says that the power is in the Son proxime (προσεχῶς), and through the Son (διὰ τοῦ προσεχῶς) in the Holy Spirit; or, as Basil himself explains the matter elsewhere: "the natural goodness and essential holiness and royal dignity flow from the Father through the Only-begotten into the Spirit" (De Sp. S., n. 47). Therefore the power and operation, though numerically one in the three Persons, is incommunicable in the Father; from the Father it is communicated to the Son; from the Father and the Son (that is, from the Father through the Son) it is communicated to the Holy Spirit. "When we inquire whether the bestowal of good things has its origin from the Spirit alone... again we are led by Scripture to believe that the Only-begotten God is the author and cause of the bestowal of goods

accomplished in us through the Holy Spirit" (95)... "After we have been lifted to this understanding, we are further elevated by divinely inspired guidance and taught that through that power (of the Spirit and of the Son) indeed all things are produced from nothing, yet not from that [power] without a beginning (οὐ μὴν ἐκ ἐκείνης ἀνάρχως); rather there is a certain power existing unbegottenly and without beginning, which is the cause of the cause of all things that exist" (96). "For from the Father [is] the Son through whom are all things, with whom the Holy Spirit is in every way inseparably co-understood."

Basil subjoins to this a clearer explanation of the distinction of the Persons in those words which Macarius has shrouded in darkness by his version. "Accordingly," says the holy Doctor, "since the Holy Spirit—from whom every bestowal of good things flows forth upon the creature—depends upon the Son (surely as to origin), with whom He is immediately co-understood; and since He has His being dependent on the Father as cause, whence also He proceeds: He has this as the distinguishing seal of His hypostatic property, namely, that He is made known after the Son and with Him, and that He subsists from the Father. But the Son, who by Himself and with Himself makes known the Spirit proceeding from the Father, He alone, the Only-begotten, having shone forth from the unbegotten light, has no communion, as regards the peculiarity of distinguishing characteristics, either with the Father or with the Holy Spirit; but by the signs I have mentioned He alone is recognized. And He who is

---

95 Πάλιν ὑπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ὁδηγούμεθα εἰς τὸ τῆς χορηγίας τῶν ἀγαθῶν τῶν διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἡμῖν ἐνεργουμένων ἀρχηγὸν καὶ αἴτιον τὸν μονογενῆ Θεὸν εἶναι πιστεύειν.

96 Ἀλλὰ τίς ἐστι δύναμις ἀγεννήτως καὶ ἀνάρχως ὑφεστῶσα, ἥτις ἐστὶν αἰτία τῆς ἁπάντων τῶν ὄντων αἰτίας. Elsewhere in Basil this is ἡ προκαταρκτικὴ αἰτία and ἡ πρώτη αἰτία.

God over all has as His own a certain pre-eminent mark of His hypostasis, namely to be Father, and to subsist from no cause" (97).

After this statement of the distinction he teaches at greater length the indistinguishable unity of the divine essence and attributes in the three Persons; and finally, by that famous similitude of a golden chain, he explains still more clearly the internal economy of the Most Holy Trinity—namely, that as the Son is with the Father, so the Spirit is with the Son, and therefore the Son, as it were in the middle, coheres indivisibly by an internal sequence of order—and hence of origin—on the one hand with the Father and on the other with the Holy Spirit. "Thinking of the Father," he says, "he thought of Him both in Himself and, at the same time, embraced the Son in mind; and he who embraced the latter did not separate from the Son the Spirit; but, in sequence as to order and in unity as to nature, he impressed upon himself the faith of three conjoined according to identity (of essence). And though he said 'Spirit' alone, he included in the same confession also Him whose Spirit He is. And since, as Paul teaches (Rom. VIII, 9), He is the Spirit of Christ and [as the Apostle says] 'from God' (1 Cor. II, 12); just as he who grasps one end of a chain simultaneously draws the other end, so he who has drawn the

---

97 Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἀφ' οὗ πᾶσα ἐπὶ τὴν κτίσιν ἡ τῶν ἀγαθῶν χορηγία πηγάζει, τοῦ υἱοῦ μὲν ἤρτηται, ᾧ ἀδιαστάτως συγκαταλαμβάνεται, τῆς δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς αἰτίας ἐξημμένον ἔχει τὸ εἶναι, ὅθεν καὶ ἐκπορεύεται· τοῦτο τὸ γνωριστικὸν τῆς κατὰ τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἰδιότητος σημεῖον ἔχει, τὸ μετὰ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ γνωρίζεσθαι, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑφεστάναι. Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ὁ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον πνεῦμα δι' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ γνωρίζων, μόνος μονογενῶς ἐκ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου φωτὸς ἐκλάμψας, οὐδεμίαν κατὰ τὸ ἰδιάζον τῶν γνωρισμάτων κοινωνίαν ἔχει πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἢ πρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἀλλὰ τοῖς εἰρημένοις σημείοις μόνος γνωρίζεται. Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς ἐξαίρετόν τι γνώρισμα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ὑποστάσεως, τὸ πατὴρ εἶναι καὶ ἐκ μηδεμιᾶς αἰτίας ὑποστῆναι, μόνος ἔχει.

Spirit, as the prophet says (Ps. 118 [119], 131), through Him has drawn along both the Son and the Father together. And if anyone has truly grasped the Son, he will have Him at the same time leading both ways—on the one side His own Father, on the other His proper Spirit. For the Son—who is ever in the Father—cannot be cut off from the Father; nor is He ever separated from His own Spirit, who performs all things in Him... Nor can any cleaving or division be conceived in any way, such that the Son be understood apart from the Father, or the Spirit be separated from the Son" (98). Such, then, is the doctrine of Basil, reducible to these heads.

α) The power of operating and of bestowing all gifts—and hence the divine power in the Holy Spirit—is from the Son, yet not as from the primordial cause, since in the Son the same power is from the Father; therefore the Father is the unbegotten cause of the cause of all things; accordingly, the power in the Holy Spirit is through the Son from the Father as from a principle without principle.

---

98 Ὁ τὸν πατέρα νοήσας, αὐτὸν τε ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἐνόησε, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τῇ διανοίᾳ συμπαρεδέξατο. Ὁ δὲ τοῦτον λαβών, τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα οὐκ ἀπεμέρισεν, ἀλλ' ἀκολούθως μὲν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν, συνημμένως δὲ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν τῶν τριῶν κατὰ ταὐτὸν συγκεκραμένην ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν πίστιν ἀνετυπώσατο. Καὶ ὁ τὸ πνεῦμα μόνον εἰπών, συμπεριέλαβε τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ ταὐτῇ καὶ τὸν οὗ ἐστι τὸ πνεῦμα· καὶ ἐπειδή τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστὶ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καθὼς φησὶν ὁ Παῦλος, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀλύσεως τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄκρου ἁψάμενος καὶ τὸ ἕτερον ἄκρον συνεπεσπάσατο, οὕτως ὁ τὸ πνεῦμα ἑλκύσας, καθὼς φησὶν ὁ προφήτης, δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα συνεφείλκυσεν· καὶ εἰ τὸν υἱὸν ἀληθῶς τις λάβοι, ἔχει αὐτὸν ἑκατέρωθεν, ἐν μὲν τὸν ἴδιον πατέρα, ἐν δὲ τὸ ἴδιον πνεῦμα συνεπαγόμενον. Οὔτε γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ ἀεὶ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ὢν ἀποτμηθῆναι δυνήσεται, οὔτε τοῦ πνεύματος ποτε διαζευχθήσεται τοῦ ἰδίου ὁ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνεργῶν... Οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐπινοῆσαι τομὴν ἢ διαίρεσιν καθ' οὐδένα τρόπον, ὡς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς χωρὶς πατρὸς νοηθῇ, ἢ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ διαζευχθῇ.

β) Hence, although the Holy Spirit is one with the Father and the Son in divine power and nature, nevertheless, as a distinct Person, He depends upon the Son, and—as upon the cause of the cause—He depends upon the Father, from whom therefore He is said in Scripture to proceed.

γ) From these things it is deduced what the distinguishing characters of the Persons are, and that these are by that very fact eternally inlaid and proper to each Person. The personal character of the Holy Spirit is not exhausted by the fact that He proceeds from the Father; rather, a twofold consideration is to be made in Him: that He is made manifest (γνωρίζεται) after the Son and with the Son, and that He subsists from the Father. A twofold aspect corresponds to this also in the personal character of the Son: that He by Himself and with Himself makes manifest (γνωρίζει) the Holy Spirit, and that He alone, as Only-begotten (μόνος μονογενῶς—what other Fathers elsewhere call μόνος ἐκ μόνου), shines forth from the Father.

Now the personal character that really distinguishes one divine Person from another cannot be merely manifestation and operation ad extra—for this would be the Sabellian heresy; rather, of necessity it is an immanent, eternal, personal property, although this inlaid property can also be considered in relation to what is ad extra. Thus the Fathers often teach that the begotten Wisdom (the Son) and the subsisting Holiness (the Holy Spirit) proceed eternally with a (notional) relation to the works of creation and to the gifts of sanctification; whence, by His very mode of proceeding as eternal Love capable of being given, the Holy Spirit is called by the hypostatic name "Gift." Therefore, when Basil teaches that the personal and distinguishing property of the Holy Spirit is not only that He subsists from the Father, but equally that He is made manifest after the Son and with the Son, this manifestation—this γνωρίζεσθαι—is necessarily understood as an eternal, ontological manifestation ad

intra, as a notion and γνώρισμα distinguishing the Spirit from the Son. But the manifestation of a divine Person ad intra is nothing other than an eternal shining-forth (ἔκλαμψις, ἔκφανσις—terms which Basil applies both to the generation of the Son and to the procession of the Spirit), that is, the procession of the Person. Therefore the Spirit shines forth after the Son, if the internal order of the processions is considered—because the Son, as the second Person, is presupposed, in order that from Him the third Person, the Holy Spirit, may shine forth; yet lest a temporal succession be imagined, therefore He is said to shine forth, just as He is posterior to the Son in order of origin, so also "with the Son" in eternity without any order of time. Now this ontological manifestation ad intra, that is, the production of the Holy Spirit, is also, in relation to what is ad extra, a manifestation for our knowing; for as the Light is the Son from the Light the Father, so the third Light from the Father and the Son (Epiphanius's words, haer. 74, n. 8) is the Holy Spirit, who shines forth as the object of our faith on the way and of our vision in the homeland. Therefore, by the very generation the Father manifests the Son, and by the very spiration the Father and the Son manifest the Holy Spirit to us also by an ontological and foundational manifestation; and thus what the Most Holy Trinity essentially is to itself, It willed also to be for us. In this way, at last, we have understood the inner reason why and how the distinguishing characters of the Persons are called by Basil and other Doctors "notions" or "manifestations" (γνωρίσματα): because by these characters the divine Persons both are, as it were, sealed and distinguished in themselves (γνωρίζονται καθ' ἑαυτάς), and by these same characters they are knowable to vision and to faith (γνωρίζονται τῇ ἐπιγνώσει).

Nor can the Photian party take exception on the ground that Basil says only that the Spirit is manifested "after" the Son, not "by"

the Son. First, Basil teaches that the distinguishing character of the Holy Spirit is His order with respect to the Son, namely that He shines forth after the Son. But among the divine Persons, apart from Arian heresy, no order can be conceived except the order of origin (as we have seen declared by Basil himself and by his brother Gregory of Nyssa). Therefore, in the very fact that, as a distinguishing character of the Holy Spirit, it is proposed that He is posterior to the Son in order, there is already contained the origin of the Spirit from the Son (Th. XXXIII, n. I). But there is no need for argument: for Basil in express words teaches that, corresponding to this character of the Holy Spirit—that He is made manifest (γνωρίζεται) after the Son—there is in the Son the ratio of principle, in that He makes manifest (γνωρίζει) the Holy Spirit "after Himself." Since, from what has been proved, this manifestation is ontological and ad intra, certainly the Son is said to produce the third Light, and therefore the Spirit to shine forth from the Son. Hence two notions are assigned to the Son, by one of which He is distinguished from the Father—namely, that from the unbegotten Light He, the begotten Light, shines forth; by the other He is distinguished from the Holy Spirit—namely, that He manifests, or actively causes, the Spirit to shine forth. Therefore, since the Son shines forth from the Father, and from the Son the Spirit shines forth, we are brought back to that doctrine of Basil by which the passage we are treating is excellently illustrated. "Just as," he says, "the Son stands in relation to the Father, so the Spirit to the Son; for this reason the Word of God (the Father) is the Son, but the Word of the Son is the Spirit." He concedes that Catholics, just as they proclaim the Son to be the Image of God the Father and the Word of God, so they proclaim the Spirit to be the Image of the Son and the Word of the Son; yet He is not said to be the Son of the Son, because Scripture teaches there to be only one Son. Nonetheless, the Apostle clearly proclaimed the Spirit to be "from God," and made it plain that

He "has shone forth through the Son" (καὶ τὸ δι᾽ υἱοῦ πεφηνέναι), when he named Him the Spirit of God and of the Son, and called Him the Mind of Christ just as [he called Him] the Spirit of God (Contra Eunom., V, pp. 304–306) (99).

δ) With these there cohere all the things which, in the same place, Basil then subjoins from the similitude of a chain concerning the order and communion of the divine Persons. "According to nature," he says, "they are one; but as distinct Persons, by an internal order they follow upon one another (ἡ ἀκολουθία κατὰ τὴν τάξιν). And such is the order that in the Father is the Son, in the Son the Holy Spirit, so that—just as in a chain—the Father is one extremity, the Spirit the other extremity, while the Son, as the middle, is on the one hand in the Father as in His principle, and, on the other hand, He Himself— as principle—has in Himself His own Spirit." This is proved from Scripture, in which He is called the "Spirit of God"; and from the same Scriptures it is clear that by the name "God," in relation to the Spirit, both the Father and the Son are understood, since He is also distinctly called the "Spirit of the Father" and the "Spirit of the Son." For Paul calls Him the "Spirit of Christ" as well as the "Spirit from God." So, for Basil, it comes to the same thing to say "the Spirit from God" and "the Spirit of God"; therefore, of whichever divine

99 The common Greek and Latin opinion concerning the genuineness of books IV and V of Contra Eunomium has again been vindicated—and Garnerius's doubts answered—by Maranus in the Vita Basilii, c. 43, n. 7; cf. Fabricius, Bibl. Graec., T. IX, n. 7 (Migne, PG, T. XXXIX, p. CCLI).

Person He is called the Spirit, from that Person He is understood to proceed (100).

It has seemed good to expound this text of Basil, adduced by Macarius, somewhat more distinctly, so that one may have a specimen of the kind of testimonies of the Fathers which the Photian party, by breaking them off from their context and by perverting the very words, say contain a "formal or equivalent denial" of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son. In what follows, we shall settle the quibbles very briefly.

ε) A second passage of Basil is cited by Macarius as if it denied the same procession, from Hom. 24, n. 6, Contra Sabellianos et Arianos, in these words: "With the Father indeed I know the Spirit, and I know the Spirit not to be the Father; and with the Son I have received the Spirit, who nevertheless is not called 'Son'; yet I represent to myself in Him a kinship with the Father, because He proceeds from the Father, and another [kinship] with the Son, because I read: 'If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Him'" (101). But first Macarius's version needs correction. Basil does not say that the Holy Spirit has one "kinship" with the Son and another with the Father; for by these words that

---

100 We have demonstrated in Thesis XXXII, n. II that this doctrine and the explanation of the places of Scripture in which the Spirit is called the Spirit of God, the Spirit of the Father, and the Spirit of the Son are common to Greek and Latin Doctors.

101 Cependant je me réprésente en lui une parenté avec le Père, parce qu'il procéde du Père, et une autre avec le Fils, parce que je lis: si quelqu'un n'a point l'Esprit du Christ, il n'est point à lui.

Translation: However, I conceive in him a kinship with the Father, because he proceeds from the Father, and another with the Son, because I read: "If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to him."

very heresy would be asserted which Basil is opposing—that is, the consubstantiality of the three Persons would be denied. For οἰκειότης πρὸς τινα in Basil—as very frequently in other Fathers—signifies, in the Most Holy Trinity, the unity of nature together with the derivation or origin of one Person from another; whence one never says, nor could say, οἰκειότης τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸς τὸν υἱόν or τοῦ υἱοῦ πρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, but always, in the reverse order, one predicates οἰκειότης τοῦ υἱοῦ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, τοῦ πνεύματος πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καὶ υἱόν, ἤγουν πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους (102). Now, if "one kinship" were said with the Father and "another" with the Son, by that very fact the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son would be denied; and consequently the unity of the Holy Spirit would not be able to be a unity of nature with both.

Basil, in order to set forth the distinction of the Person and the unity of the Holy Spirit's nature with the Father and the Son—on which alone, in that place, he is directly discoursing against the Arians and Pneumatomachi—speaks thus: "I understand His unity with the Father, since (from the words of Scripture) He proceeds from the Father; and I understand that same [unity] with the Son, because I hear: 'If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Him.' For if He is not one with Christ (and His proper Spirit), how

102 Οἰκεῖος, like ἴδιος, means "proper"; hence it is correct indeed to say οἰκεῖος, ἴδιος πατήρ τοῦ υἱοῦ, but one cannot say ὁ πατὴρ τῷ υἱῷ οἰκεῖος, ἴδιος; on the contrary, one must say ὁ υἱὸς τῷ πατρὶ οἰκεῖος, ἤγουν ἴδιος. By the same reasoning one predicates τὸ πνεῦμα ἴδιον, οἰκεῖον τῷ υἱῷ, and τὸ πνεύματος οἰκειότης πρὸς τὸν υἱόν.

does He unite [us] with Christ? But I also hear Him called the Spirit of truth, and 'the Truth' is the Lord (Christ)" ([103]).

Now who does not see that by these words not only is the procession from the Son not excluded, but it is most plainly included? It is contained both in the meaning of unity with the Son and, in agreement with Basil and the other Fathers, in the fact that He is predicated "the Spirit of Christ," "the Spirit of truth"; that is—as we heard elsewhere from Basil—"the Word and Mind of Christ," just as "of God," since from what has been shown above Basil and the other Fathers always take this locution of Scripture, "the Spirit of God," "the Spirit of the Son," in the relative signification of origin (compare the texts cited above from Contra Eunom. I, II, n. 34).

2º From Gregory of Nyssa likewise Macarius adduces two testimonies in which, he says, the procession of the Spirit from the Son is expressly denied.

a) He places the earlier passage (l. advers. Graecos de communibus notionibus, Migne, T. XLV, p. 179) here in his fourth class, whereas it ought to belong to his third class, since in that text nothing at all is contained except the Catholic doctrine that the Father is the principle of the other two Persons—of the Son and of the Holy Spirit—and that these are from the Father as from the principle of the whole Deity, as the Fathers speak and as has been set forth even in the Florentine definition. Nor, indeed, was there any need, for the gentiles to whom Gregory wrote, to explain how the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. He explained this most clearly when writing against heretics and setting forth to Catholics the economy of the Most Holy Trinity in the places cited by us above. If

---

[103] Ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν πρὸς πατέρα οἰκειότητα νοῶ, ἐπειδὴ ἐκ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται· τὴν δὲ πρὸς υἱὸν, ἐπειδὴ ἀκούω· εἴ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ οἰκεῖον Χριστοῦ, πῶς οἰκειοῖ τῷ Χριστῷ; Ἀλλὰ καὶ πνεῦμα ἀκούω τῆς ἀληθείας· ἀλήθεια δὲ ὁ κύριος.

you compare those passages with this place written against the gentiles, you will see that the procession of the Spirit from the Father through the Son is indicated here as well.

To explain how it is not contrary to philosophical notions to say "one God" and "three Persons," Gregory uses that Platonic doctrine—set forth by himself elsewhere—according to which, he judges, Peter, Paul, and Barnabas are not properly but only abusively said to be "three men," since they ought rather to be called "three persons and one man," because humanity is one and not multiple (see Tract. de Trin., Th. IX, Scholion). Nonetheless, he says there are reasons why that abuse of speech—by which many men are called "men [in the plural]"—becomes necessary: namely, because men, though not distinct in nature, are nevertheless distinguished and differ from each other by many accidents. But in God there are no such accidents; and so the three Persons are to be called "one God" and by no means "three Gods," because the one deity, numerically one, is communicated by one Person to the other two. The words to which Macarius appeals are these: "Not all human persons have their being proxime (κατὰ τὸ προσεχές) from one person; rather, some are from this person, others from that, so that many and different persons exist, not only those who are from others as from a cause, but also those who are themselves the cause of others. In the Holy Trinity, however, it is not so. For the one and the same Person of the Father is He from whom the Son is begotten and the Holy Spirit proceeds. Therefore, we properly call Him alone 'one God' who is the cause of those who proceed from Him as from a cause, since He also exists in them." In this whole comparison between many human persons—who are among themselves diverse and not from one principle but from many—and the divine Persons—who are distinct but not diverse among themselves, and are from one principle—the words in which Macarius has seen an express denial of the procession of the

Spirit also from the Son can only be those: "For the one and the same Person of the Father is He from whom the Son is begotten and the Holy Spirit proceeds." But this is a Catholic truth; whoever denied it would necessarily fall into ditheism or tritheism. Indeed, two or three divine Persons—of whom one did not proceed from another by the communication of the numerically one nature—could not be conceived without simultaneously and absurdly conceiving, along with Persons separate from one another, just so many divine natures. Therefore, not only Gregory but most of the Fathers, in order to assert the unity of God, so insistently press τὴ μοναρχίαν—that there is one principle, the Father—from whom, by an immanent procession and by the communication of the one deity, the Son and the Holy Spirit proceed. This unity of principle (ἡ μοναρχία) suffices to assert the unity of the deity in three Persons; nor, to this end, is it necessary explicitly to declare the difference of the manner in which the second and the third Person proceed from the first, although this is already implicitly contained in the necessary ontological order of the Persons (see Th. XXXIII). Hence, when Gregory was asserting against the gentiles the unity of the deity in distinct divine Persons—and that unity one far different from what exists in diverse human persons—it sufficed for him to note that human persons are not all proxime from one person as from a principle, whereas the divine Persons, the Son and the Spirit, are both from one Person, the Father, by an immanent procession as from their principle.

The question is asked whether that particle κατὰ τὸ προσεχές, by which he denies that men are from one principle "proximately," is to be understood also in the second clause, so that both divine Persons would be said to be "proximately" (κατὰ τὸ προσεχές) from the one Father. The Photian party simply affirm this; for, in their doctrine, the Spirit is from the Father alone to the exclusion of the Son, no less than the Son is from the Father alone (μόνος ἐκ μόνου).

Hence the two processions are not, according to them, "according to the order of sequence" (κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς ἀκολουθίας, which Basil affirms), but are both, as it were, parallel from the one Father, and therefore both "proximately" (προσεχῶς) from the Father. Gregory of Nyssa answers this question not cursorily but at length and expressly by denying it; indeed, when he declares the Catholic faith more distinctly against heretics, he makes the very economy of the Trinity and the real distinction of the third Person from the second consist precisely in this: that the Son alone is "proximately" from the first Person (προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου), whereas the Spirit is from the Father through Him who is "proximately" from the Father—that is, the third Person through the second from the first (διὰ τοῦ προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου). Hence, "to be from the Father as from a principle" is common to the Son and to the Spirit; both are αἰτιατοί ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου αἰτίου; but they are distinguished from each other by the different modes in which they are from the Father: the Son proximately from the Father—He alone from the Alone (μόνος μονογενῶς); the Spirit from the Father through the Son. Therefore the Son is distinguished from the Spirit by no other mode except that, as principle of the Spirit, He is—by order of origin—prior to the Holy Spirit (τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἐπινοία μόνη κατὰ τὸν τῆς αἰτίας λόγον προθεωρουμένη τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος ὑποστάσεως). See the doctrine of Gregory described above.

Accordingly, the testimony brought forward by Macarius, if considered by itself, contains absolutely nothing about the exclusion of the Son in the production of the Holy Spirit, since in it there is considered only what is common to the Son and to the Spirit—namely, that both are "from a principle" (αἰτιατοί). But if the same testimony be compared with others in which Gregory explains the distinction of the second Person from the third, then it is understood

that even in this very place there is implicitly included the procession of the Spirit from one principle—the Father and the Son.

b) The second passage which Macarius, counting on his readers' ignorance, thrusts upon them as a formal exclusion of the Son from the notion of principle of the Holy Spirit contains one of those arguments of Gregory by which there is explicitly and evidently affirmed that very thing which the schismatics say is denied. The testimony is taken from Contra Eunomium, I (Migne, T. XLV, p. 336), and is a twin to those passages of Basil brought forward above (Ep. 38, n. 4; and Contra Eunom., V). Gregory there unfolds both those things that are common to the divine Persons and those things that are proper to each and by which they are distinguished among themselves. Concerning the Holy Spirit, the passage—which Macarius, as is his custom, has not described without some mutilation —reads thus: "The Holy Spirit, who has in common with the Father and the Son that He is of uncreated nature, is, in turn, distinguished from them by His own proper notions (τοῖς ἰδίοις γνωρίσμασιν). For His notion and most proper seal is that He is none of the things which, as proper, the doctrine (in the antecedents) considered in the Father and in the Son. For that which neither subsists unbegotten (as the Father) nor Only-begotten (as the Son), yet truly subsists—this exhibits His property distinguishing Him from those [properties] that were said before (namely, the properties of the Father and of the Son). For with the Father He is one according to the uncreated essence; again, He is distinguished from Him in that He is not Father, as He is. With the Son He is indeed one by identity of uncreated nature, and in that He has the cause of His subsistence from the God of the universe (namely, it is common to the Son and to the Spirit to be from the Father); yet from Him (the Son) He is distinguished by a property—let the Photians take note—both in that He does not subsist Only-begotten from the Father, and in that through this very

Son He shines forth" ([104]). "Moreover, since the creature exists through the Only-begotten, lest the Spirit be thought to have anything in common with this [creature] on the ground that He shines forth through the Son, the Spirit is separated from the creature by His immobility and immutability and by the fact that He has no need to receive His goodness from elsewhere (but is Himself essential goodness)."

You see that the property of the Holy Spirit is clearly asserted by which He is distinguished from the Son: namely, that He does not proceed from the Father "Only-begottenly" as the Son does, but that He shines forth from the Father "through the Son." That an internal and eternal shining-forth is meant is plain already from the fact that this shining-forth "through the Son" is the personal property constituting the Spirit as a Person distinct from the Son; and it is explained yet more explicitly by the comparison with creatures. It is true, says Nyssa, as the Eunomians affirm, that both all created things have their existence through the Son and the Holy Spirit shines forth through the same Son. But creatures are produced through the Son in

---

[104] Macarius distorts this sentence—in which the Photian heresy is excluded—by his interpretation: mais il s'en distingue en ce qu'il procède autrement que le Fils unique (μήτε μονογενῶς) et qu'il est manifesté par le Fils. The entire following period—in which the "shining-forth through the Son" is manifestly declared as the eternal production of the Spirit through the Son—is cautiously suppressed in silence by the Photian. — Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα... τῇ πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν κατὰ τὸ ἄκτιστον συναφείᾳ καὶ ἐν τῷ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ὑπάρξεως ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν ὅλων ἔχειν ἐνούμενον, ἀφίσταται πάλιν ἐν τῷ ἰδιάζοντι· ἐν τῷ μήτε μονογενῶς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑποστῆναι καὶ ἐν τῷ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ πεφηνέναι. Πάλιν δὲ τῆς κτίσεως διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ὑποστάσης, ὡς ἂν μὴ κοινότητα τινὰ πρὸς ταύτην ἔχειν νομισθῇ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ πεφηνέναι, ἐν τῷ ἀτρέπτῳ καὶ ἀναλλοιώτῳ καὶ ἀπροσδεεῖ τῆς ἑτέρωθεν ἀγαθότητος διακρίνεται τὸ πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως.

a participated and mutable nature, whereas the Spirit is produced through the same Son in an immutable nature and in essential perfection. Therefore, the Spirit does not differ from creatures in this, that the latter have their existence from the Father through the Son, while the Spirit is from the Father alone; rather, He agrees with them in this: that He too has His existence from the Father through the Son, as from one principle; but the difference is infinite in that the Spirit is produced from the Father through the Son by the communication of the one essence and essential goodness, whereas creatures are produced by the creation of a finite nature. Compare Bessarion, Orat. dogm., c. 6 (Mansi, T. XXXI, pp. 923–927).

3° How, from Epiphanius, any testimony could be produced that expressly denies procession from the Son, anyone who has read the most manifest and often repeated doctrine of the holy Father which we have described will, to be sure, marvel. Nevertheless, Macarius—whose brow does not know how to blush—produces two texts in which there is perhaps some obscurity because of an uncertain reading; yet most certainly, in the first nothing at all is said about the procession of the Holy Spirit; in the second, if it is compared with other places of Epiphanius, the procession from the one principle—which is the one God, the Father and the Son—is affirmed.

α) From the Ancoratus, n. 2, the adversary cites these words: "Verus Deus unus est, nam ab uno solo procedunt solus Filius unicus et solus Spiritus Sanctus" (105). If Epiphanius had written thus, he would have said nothing other than what—in Catholic doctrine—everyone professes without doubt: that God is one, not many gods; and likewise that the Father is one, not many; the Son one; and the

---

105 Car d'un seul proviennent le seul Fils unique et le seul Esprit-Saint.

Translation: For from one alone proceed the only-begotten Son and the only Holy Spirit

Holy Spirit one; and that the two latter Persons proceed from the Father, who alone is one. We freely concede also that Epiphanius, not rarely, affirms what Scripture, the symbols, the Fathers, and all Catholics teach: that the Father is the principle of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and that the Son and the Holy Spirit proceed from the Father. Therefore (as we have often already warned), the controversy with the Photian party is not about this affirmative doctrine, but solely about the mode whereby the Father is the principle of the Holy Spirit: whether the Spirit proceeds from the Father insofar as the Father, as to all the other attributes (except the properties constituting the Persons), is one with the Son—even in spiration; or whether, rather, the Son is generated by the Father stripped of the spirative power. But about this question, in the words which Macarius adduces —if we were to admit them—absolutely nothing is said.

In truth, Epiphanius has used neither these words, devised by the Photian, nor any such words in any place. In that context he explains against the Arians the words of the Savior: "ut cognoscant te solum Deum verum, et quem misisti Iesum Christum" (John XVII, 3). Now, "one only true God" is said in opposition to the fictitious gods; and this one true God is the three Persons, both all together and the one only Father, the one only Son, the Only-begotten of the Father, and the one only Holy Spirit—about whose procession, whether from the Father or from the Son, he indeed says nothing in this place, but presupposes it and, as he progresses in the book, frequently explains of what sort it is (Ancor., nn. 7, 8, 67, 70, 71, 72; cf. Haer. LXXIV, nn. 7, 8, 10). Here are the genuine words of Epiphanius without the Macarian distortion: "When Christ says 'only true God,' He leads us back to the unity of God (εἰς μοναρχίαν), lest a multitude of gods be among us... 'And whom You have sent, Jesus Christ.' Whom [do we call] Jesus Christ? Namely, true God. Now, if—as John says of Him—the Only-begotten, who is in the

bosom of the Father, He Himself has declared Him, God has sent Jesus Christ; therefore there is one God the Father and the only true God—not like the false gods whom some of the gentiles considered gods when they were not gods; but the Only-begotten is the one true God, since He alone is from the Alone; and the one [true God] is that one only Holy Spirit: for there is Trinity in unity, and one God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" (106). Therefore it is not Epiphanius but Macarius who says with his own words: "ab uno solo procedunt solus Filius unicus et solus Spiritus Sanctus." The holy Doctor reserves, both here and elsewhere (cf. Haer. LXXIV, n. 10; Ancorat., n. 73), for the Son that constant epithet "solus ex solo Patre" (μόνος ἐκ μόνου), by which the property is designated that distinguishes the Son not only from the Father but also from the Spirit; nor did he ever transfer, nor could he transfer, it to the Holy Spirit. For Epiphanius most expressly teaches in the passages cited that this third Person does not proceed "from the Father alone," but "from the Father and the Son," as we have shown above—not to mention the manifest contradiction contained in the words thrust upon us by Macarius. For if the Spirit were said to be "alone from the Father alone," by that very fact it would be denied that the Son is "from the Father alone" (107); conversely, since the Son alone is from the Father alone, the Spirit is no longer from the Father alone, but (as Epiphanius teaches) the Son is "Wisdom from

---

106 Καὶ ἐν "ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν." Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τίνα; ἀληθινὸν Θεόν. Εἰ δὲ Θεὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὡς λέγει περὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰωάννης, ὁ μονογενής, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, αὐτὸς ἐξηγήσατο· εἷς Θεὸς τοίνυν ὁ πατήρ, καὶ μόνος ἀληθινὸς Θεός, καὶ οὐ κατὰ τοὺς ἐψευσμένους θεούς... ἀλλὰ μόνος ἀληθινὸς Θεός, ἐπειδὴ μόνος ἐκ μόνου, ὁ μονογενής, καὶ μόνον τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα· τριάς γὰρ ἐν μονάδι, καὶ εἷς Θεός, πατήρ, υἱὸς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα.

107 You see how worthless is the conjecture in Migne's edition, where to that καὶ μόνον τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα there is added the note: "Locus corruptus, forte μόνον ἐκ μόνου."

Wisdom, Life from Life"; the Spirit, however, is from both: "Spirit from Spirit; for God is Spirit" (Haer. LXXIV, n. 7).

β) Another passage "expressly denying procession from the Son" is found, they say, in Haer. LXXVI, in the refutation of chapter VIII of the Anomoean Aëtius (ed. Petavius, T. I, p. 944). Macarius cites these words: "increatus Pater qui genuit Filium increatum, et increatus Spiritus Sanctus procedens ab ipso et pariter increatus" (108).

The same off-key note is always strummed. If these were Epiphanius's words, the testimony would not pertain to a formal denial of Catholic doctrine, but to the solemn defense of the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity so frequent among the Fathers, who, against the Arians, affirm—and, to demonstrate the divinity of the Holy Spirit, even more forcefully press—His procession from the Father. But a simple inspection of the words will easily persuade anyone that Epiphanius could not have written thus: "increatus Spiritus Sanctus est increatus." In the place very precisely indicated by Macarius, the doctrine against the Anomoean Aëtius is this: the Only-begotten Son is by true generation from the substance of the Father—not in the way in which many sons are created and adopted by God. For all these, when they were not, in order that they might be, obtained production; they are sons now only by a naming (ψιλῇ λέξει), not according to essence by a true name, but nominally and by grace of Him who is not called by a bare name but is Son according to truth—by grace, namely, "from the One through the One," with Him "who

---

108 Et incréé est l'Esprit-Saint procédant de lui (et non pas d'eux) et pareillement incréé.

Translation: And the Holy Spirit is uncreated, proceeding from Him (and not from them), and likewise uncreated.

proceeds from Him and receives from Him" (109). According to the words of Scripture, to be sure, the Spirit is said to "proceed from the Father" and to "receive from the Son," which—both per se (Th. XXXII) and, by name, in the doctrine of Epiphanius—is nothing other than procession from the Son. "Christ is believed to be God from God, from the Father; and the Spirit from Christ—or from both (καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων)—as Christ testifies: 'who proceeds from the Father'; and 'He will receive of Mine'" (Ancorat., n. 67; Haer. LXXIV, n. 4; cf. Ancorat., n. 73).

4º From Cyril of Alexandria—who in nearly all his writings explains procession and spiration from the Father and the Son, or from the Father through the Son, in the manner indicated above and demonstrated in our theses—Macarius has found a single testimony, translated into Latin in the Catena of Cordier (on Luke XI, 20; Antwerp 1628, p. 324), by which procession from the Son is expressly excluded. It reads thus: "He [the Son] calls the Holy Spirit 'the Finger of God'; for He Himself [the Son] is called the arm of God and of the Father, in that the [Father] works all things through Him, just as the Son in like manner works in the Spirit. Therefore, just as the finger adheres to the hand, not as something diverse from it, but as something inserted in it by nature; so too the Holy Spirit, although

109 Οὗτοι γὰρ πάντες ψιλῇ λέξει, τὸ τῆς ἀναγωγῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι εἰς τὸ εἶναι προκεκομισμένοι, οὐ κατ' οὐσίαν τῇ ἀληθινῇ ἵστανται ὀνομασίᾳ (υἱοί), ἀλλὰ ψιλῶς καὶ κατὰ χάριν τοῦ οὐ ψιλῇ ὀνομασίᾳ ὀνομαζομένου, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἀλήθειαν, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑνὸς διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς σὺν τῷ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευομένῳ, τοῦ αὐτοῦ λαμβάνοντι.

He also proceeds from God the Father, is consubstantially connected with the Son, and through Him the Son works all things" (110).

From these words you can draw nothing that would deny procession from the Son; for (as we have often shown already) the affirmation of procession from the Father not only does not exclude procession from the Son, but indeed the latter cannot be understood in a Catholic sense without the former, nor the former without the latter. In these very words of Cyril there are, moreover, many things that fully agree with other places of his, in which he explicitly and expressly declares the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son. Since Macarius has already appealed to Cordier's Catena, he might as well have read this explicit doctrine of Cyril on that very page 324 to which he appeals. There Cordier sets down Cyril's words from the Thesaurus (Opp. Cyrilli, T. V, p. 339); but, lest we be entangled in a translation that in the Catena renders the sense rather

---

110 Macarius cites it thus: unitus est Filio, tametsi ex Deo Patre procedat. "Thus these words of St. Cyril are read." in Catena graecor. PP., latine edita a Corderio, Antverpiae 1628, p. 324 (Macarius, p. 383). But it does not read so there; the words are those I have set out in the text; nor was Macarius permitted to suppress the particle "et" if he wished to produce the Latin words from that Catena. Evidently, from the whole doctrine of Cyril, although the Holy Spirit also proceeds from God the Father, nevertheless He does not proceed from the Father alone. The French version in Macarius's book is false both for Cyril's entire text there, and, in this clause, utterly absurd: il est uni su Fils par coexistence. The Greek text as edited by Cardinal Mai reads thus: «Δάκτυλον δὲ Θεοῦ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμά φησι· χείρ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸς (ὁ υἱός) ὠνόμασται καὶ βραχίων τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρός... Ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ δάκτυλος ἀπήρτηται (depends) τῆς χειρός, οὐκ ἀλλότριος ὢν αὐτῆς, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῇ φυσικῶς, οὕτω καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τῷ τῆς ὁμοουσιότητος λόγῳ συνέπηται πρὸς ἕνωσιν τῷ υἱῷ, κἂν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύηται· πάντα γὰρ, ὡς ἔφην, ὁ υἱὸς ἐργάζεται διὰ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου πνεύματος.» (Migne, PG, T. LXXII, p. 704).

than the letter, we will insist on the Greek text itself: "Christ calls the Holy Spirit the 'Finger of God,' who in a certain manner springs from the divine essence and hangs from it by nature, just as the finger from the human hand. For the sacred Scriptures call the Son the 'arm' and the 'right hand' of God (Ps. 97:1; Is. 53:1)... Therefore, just as the arm is by nature fitted to the whole body... so let us think that the Word of God (the Father) is from Him and in Him by nature—if I may thus speak—and implanted (by an internal procession); and that in the Son there naturally and essentially flows from the Father the Spirit, who anoints and sanctifies all things" (111). How, pray, is the Holy Spirit said to arise and depend from the divine essence? Cyril explains this immediately from the biblical comparison with the finger. He says that He arises and depends from the divine essence as this essence is considered in the Son; and, since the Son Himself has one and the same essence communicated from the Father, by this very fact the Spirit has origin not from the Son alone, but from the one essence as it is incommunicably in the Father and communicably in the Son: "in the Son He naturally and essentially (not only by a mission ad extra, but by a communication of nature and essence ad intra) flows from the Father."

He explains this procession from the essence of the Son—and, therefore, also from the essence of the Father—again a little further on in the same Thesaurus (p. 344). The heretics, from the fact that Christ said that the Spirit would not speak from Himself but

---

111 Δάκτυλον φησὶν ἐνθάδε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τρόπον τινὰ τῆς θείας οὐσίας ἐκπεφυκὸς καὶ φυσικῶς αὐτῆς ἐκκρεμάμενον, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ δάκτυλος ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρωπείας χειρός. Βραχίονα μὲν γὰρ καὶ δεξιὰν Θεοῦ τὸν υἱὸν ἀποκαλοῦσιν αἱ θεῖαι γραφαί... Οὕτω τὸν μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ (Πατρός) λόγον ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ φυσικῶς ἡρμοσμένον—ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω—καὶ ἐμπεφυκότα λογιζώμεθα, ἐν δὲ τῷ υἱῷ φυσικῶς τὸ καὶ οὐσιωδῶς διῆκον παρὰ Πατρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα χρίων ἁγιάζει.

would receive from the Son, concluded that the Spirit was less and not consubstantial with the Son. Cyril responds that, from these very words of Christ, it is demonstrated that the Spirit proceeds from the essence of the Son by a communication of the same essence. "By those very [words]," he says, "they take scandal who should rather be instructed concerning the mystery of the Holy Spirit and understand that He is, as it were, a fruit of the divine essence, abiding in it, and proceeding from it indivisibly and inseparably (by an immanent procession)... For the Savior does not say these things about Him to indicate that the Spirit is imperfect, but rather to persuade the hearers that—since He is of His [the Son's] essence (because He receives from Him)—He will not speak anything other than what He Himself [the Son], whose Mind He is, wills. For, since He is His Mind according to blessed Paul, who says of the Spirit, 'We have the mind of Christ,' He will speak and dispose absolutely those things which He—of whom He is the Mind—also [wills]. Therefore He asserts that the Spirit will speak nothing from Himself—as if He were saying, 'It is again I who am speaking.' Just as if the mind which is in a man (as the Son is the Word and Mind of the Father) were to say concerning the word that proceeds from it (as the Spirit proceeds from the Son): 'He will speak nothing from himself, but whatever he hears he will speak.' Nor would anyone say that this common, outward word of a man is imperfect (in its own order) because it is first formed in the mind and proceeds receiving from it. Something of the sort must be accepted concerning the Holy Spirit. For, since He is the Mind of Christ, He speaks to the disciples all the things that are in Him [the Son], not speaking in any will proper to Himself, nor yet in a will alien to that One [the Son] 'in whom and from whom He is,' but as proceeding

naturally from His essence and possessing His whole will as well as His power" (112).

Again a little below (Thesaurus, p. 350) he explains this "receiving from the Son" as a procession by the communication of the divine nature, against the heretics who, from these very words of Christ, denied the divinity of the Spirit. "In order to show plainly that, since He is His Spirit, He will administer words from Him, He said for this reason: 'He will not speak from Himself, but whatever He hears He will speak, because He will receive of Mine.' For it is just as if honey were to say about its natural, inborn quality: 'It will not pour into the sense of the tasters anything from itself; rather, it will receive of Mine'; since quality, so to speak, is naturally communicated from substances to those [things] which proceed from them indivisibly—just as, as we have said already, from honey sweetness, from fire heat, from water cold. Therefore, the Spirit is not holy by participation, as those [heretics] teach, but rather naturally and

112 Δι' ὧν γὰρ ἔχρην ἐκπαιδεύεσθαι μᾶλλον τὸ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος μυστήριον, καὶ νοεῖν ὅτι δή καρπός τις ὥσπερ ἐστὶ τῆς θείας οὐσίας, ἐν αὐτῇ τε ὢν καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀμερίστως τε καὶ ἀχωρίστως προερχόμενον, καὶ ἡνωμένον κατὰ τὴν ταυτότητα τῆς φύσεως, διὰ τούτων αὐτῶν σκανδαλίζονται... Καὶ γὰρ τοῖς ὑπάρχων αὐτοῦ, ἐκεῖνα πάντως λογιεῖται καὶ διατάξει, ἅπερ ἂν καὶ αὐτός, οὗ καὶ ἐστὶ νοῦς... Ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ καὶ ὁ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ νοῦς λέγοι περὶ τοῦ προκύπτοντος ἐξ αὐτοῦ λόγου· οὐ λαλήσει ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ὅσα ἂν ἀκούσῃ, λαλήσει... Τοιαύτην τινὰ διάνοιαν δέχεσθαι χρὴ καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Νοῦς γὰρ ὑπάρχων Χριστοῦ, πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ διαλέγεται τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οὐκ ἐν ἰδίᾳ τινὶ θελήσει, οὐδὲ μὴν ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ βουλήσει τοῦ ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐξ οὗ ἐστίν, ὁμιλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ φυσικῶς προϊόν, καὶ ὅλην αὐτοῦ τὴν βούλησιν ἔχον ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν.

essentially (113) [so] (by a communication of nature and essence from the Son)."

§ VII.
On the Remaining Greek Doctors Who are Brought Forward for an Explicit Denial of a Procession from the Son

Besides those cited thus far, Macarius—in his fourth class, with which we are now dealing—includes among the Fathers who explicitly, or by equivalence, deny a procession from the Son, Gregory Nazianzen and Anastasius of Sinai, and also the three who are especially well known in this matter: Theodoret, Maximus, and John of Damascus.

1º What, then, does he finally adduce from Gregory? Nothing other than that the holy Theologian, arguing against the Arians, teaches that not only the Son but also the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and that, in comparison with the Son, what is proper to the Father is the notion of "cause," and by this alone He is distinguished from the Son, since all other things are common to the Father and the Son. But this profession—common to all Catholics—by no means denies, indeed at least implicitly affirms, a procession

113 Indeed, just as, from the substance of honey, for example, sweetness proceeds immanently and has its whole nature or quality (τὴν ποιότητα) from the honey, so the Holy Spirit proceeds immanently from the Son and has from Him His nature as communicated.

from the Father through the Son, or (which comes to the same thing) from the Father and the Son as one principle (114).

a) The first passage is cited by Macarius from Oration 25, no. 16 (in praise of Hiero). "It is common to the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit to be uncreated, and divinity is common; but it is common to the Son and the Holy Spirit that they are from the Father. The property of the Father, however, is to be unbegotten; the property of the Son is generation; of the Holy Spirit, emission" (115). Now these words, which merely affirm that the Holy Spirit, no less than the Son, is not a person without a principle but proceeds from the Father—how, pray, do they deny that the Spirit also proceeds from the Son? In fact, all Catholics profess what is said by these words: that the Father is the first Person, and for that very reason unbegotten, from whom both the second and the third Persons proceed; therefore this is common to these two Persons, that they are from the Father, so long as we consider only the procession and

---

114 Clearly, just as sweetness proceeds immanently from the substance of honey, for example, and has its whole nature or quality (τὴν ποιότητα) from honey, so the Holy Spirit proceeds immanently from the Son and has from Him the nature communicated to Him. Δεικνὺς δὲ σαφῶς, ὅτι πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχον τὰ ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάλιν διακονήσει ῥήματα, οὐ λαλήσει, φησίν, ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ... ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται. Ὅμοιον γὰρ ὡς εἰ καὶ τὸ μέλι περὶ τῆς ἐνούσης αὐτῷ φυσικῆς ποιότητος λέγοι, οὐκ ἐνθήσει τι ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτῆς τοῖς ἀπογευομένοις, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται, φυσικῶς διαβαινούσης τῆς ἐκ τῶν οὐσιῶν, ἵν᾽ οὕτως εἴπω, ποιότητος ἐπὶ τὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀμερίστως προερχόμενα, οἷον, καθάπερ ἤδη προείπομεν, ἐκ μέλιτος ἡ γλυκύτης, ἐκ πυρὸς ἡ θερμότης, ἐξ ὕδατος ἡ ψῦξις. Οὐκ οὖν μετοχικῶς ἅγιον τὸ πνεῦμα, κατὰ τὸν ἐκείνων λόγον, φυσικῶς δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ οὐσιωδῶς.

115 Κοινὲν γὰρ πατρὶ μὲν καὶ νἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι τὸ μὴ γεγονέναι, καὶ ἡ θεότης· νἱῷ δὲ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρός. Ἴδιον δὲ πατρὸς μὲν ἡ ἀγεννησία, νἱῷ δὲ ἡ γέννησις, πνεύματος δὲ ἡ ἔκπεμψις.

"being from a principle," and not yet the mode of procession—whether the Son alone is from the Father alone, while the Spirit proceeds from the Father inasmuch as He is one with the Son. Concerning this mode of procession Gregory, in that testimony at least, directly and explicitly affirms nothing; but much less does he, either there or anywhere else, deny a procession from the Father as He is one with the Son—a denial which alone Macarius would have had to prove.

Rather, the Photians ought to have noticed that Gregory the Theologian—who supplied many other Fathers with a norm of speaking—uses in that same place (no. 16) the name "emission" (ἐκπέμψις) and, in the preceding number (no. 15), the verbs προέρχεσθαι and προιέναι to signify the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father (116). Let them therefore at long last cease from the sophistical quibble about a fabricated distinction between these words and "procession" (ἐκπόρευσις), or between "emanation" and the procession of the Holy Spirit, as I hear was done not long ago at the little conventicle of heretics in Bonn; rather, let them admit—on the basis of very many testimonies in which the Fathers by these words signify the Spirit's relation to the Son—that the Photian heresy is condemned.

b) A second testimony is brought from Oration 34, no. 10 (On the Arrival of the Egyptians): "All that the Father has is the Son's, except the notion of cause; all that is the Son's is also the Holy Spirit's, except sonship, and except the things which are predicated corporally

116 ὧν δὲ πνεῦμα ἅγιον προελθὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, ἢ καὶ προιόν.

of Him on account of our humanity (assumed)" (117). Now, I ask, how can "the notion of cause" be understood as a property of the Father? It cannot be understood except in a twofold way. If one considers only the present text and context, in the first clause the Father is compared with the Son alone, just as in the second clause the comparison is of the Son alone with the Holy Spirit alone. Hence it is said: the Son has from the Father Himself all that belongs to the Father, except the notion of cause in relation to the Son, that is, except paternity, by which alone the Father is constituted as a Person distinct from the begotten Son. Therefore the Son has, as the Father does, the spirative power as well, by which the Father is not related to the Son; and by that very fact, in spiration as in all other things, He is one with the Son. Gregory thus teaches what all Catholic theologians repeat: that the properties constituting and distinguishing the three Persons are paternity, filiation, and procession.

A second way of understanding—permitted by the context and perhaps rendered more probable by the doctrine expressed elsewhere both by other Fathers and by Gregory himself—is this: that the "notion of cause" (τῆς αἰτίας), not considered only in relation to the Son but taken universally, is called the personal property of the First Person. For the Greeks, by the name τῆς αἰτίας, understand both

---

117 Πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατήρ, τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐστι, πλὴν τῆς αἰτίας· πάντα δὲ ὅσα τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος, πλὴν τῆς υἱότητος, καὶ τῶν ὅσα σωματικῶς περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγεται διὰ τὸν ἐμὸν ἄνθρωπον. — As for the phrase πλην τῆς αἰτίας, not a few manuscripts have πλὴν τῆς ἀγεννησίας. Macarius—who everywhere accuses the Latins of fraud whenever not all variant readings are cited—passes over this variation in silence, because, whether in good faith out of ignorance or with the bad faith of an impostor, in that clause πλην τῆς αἰτίας he discovers his own heresy expressed: « ainsi, selon s. Gregoire, le Fils ne peut être reconnu en aucun sens comme l'auteur ou la source du S. Esprit; cela appartient au Père seul exclusivement ».

the "principle" ad intra and "cause" ad extra; and so, when comparing the three Persons, they sometimes call only the First Person *τὴν αἰτίαν* or *τὸ αἴτιον*, because She does not have the power of "principle and cause" from another but communicates it to the others—by which predication it is certainly not denied that another Person is also a principle or cause, but it is denied that She is a principle and cause without a principle. Thus Gregory, in this very Oration 34, no. 8: "God subsists in three supreme realities: in the Cause, in the Maker, and in the Perfecter—in the Father, I say, and in the Son and in the Holy Spirit" (118). Here the distinguishing notes of the three Persons are signified immediately and directly from relations ad extra. How then can "the notion of cause" be called the distinguishing note of the Father, when it is altogether common and one in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit? The answer is this: the Father is the primordial cause without principle (*ἡ προκαταρκτικὴ αἰτία, ἡ πρώτη αἰτία, ἡ αἰτία τῆς αἰτίας*, as we heard from Basil), and therefore, hypostatically and in comparison with the other Persons—who have from Him the notion of cause—this predication is reserved to the Father alone as the First Person. Indeed, our Gregory with the other Fathers says that, in comparison with the Son, the Father is predicated hypostatically as "God," the Son as "Lord," in order to demonstrate the unity of principle. Greg., Or. 25, no. 15 (see De Trinitate, Thesis XI, no. I). Hence, what is said in the testimony objected by the Photians—namely, that all things of the Father are common to the Son "except the notion of cause"—is equivalent to saying that all things of the Father are common to the Son, with this sole exception: that the Son is not "without principle," but is from the Father, and therefore is "a principle from a Principle," as "God from God."

---

118 Θεὸς ἐν τρισὶ τοῖς μεγίστοις ἵσταται, αἰτίῳ, δημιουργῷ καὶ τελειοποιῷ, τῷ πατρὶ λέγω, καὶ τῷ υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.

Hence, when the relations of the Persons ad intra are directly considered and the character of the Father is expressed negatively—namely, that He alone is "without principle"—Nazianzen acknowledges the personal character of the Son to be that He is "principle," in relation certainly not to the Father, who is ἄναρχος, but to the Holy Spirit, who is eternally with the Father and the Son as the principle of His being: "He who is without principle, and the principle (the Son), and He who is with the principle, is one God ... Nor is 'principle,' by the fact that it is principle, separated from Him who is without principle ... and He who is with the One who lacks principle and with the principle is nothing other than what those are. But to the One who is without principle the name is 'Father'; to the 'principle,' 'Son'; to the One who is with the principle, 'Holy Spirit'" ([119]). Nazianz., Or. 42, no. 15.

Finally, the very same point which Basil stated—that the essential goodness "flows from the Father through the Son into the Holy Spirit," that is, is communicated—Nazianzen expressed in almost the same words: "There is one God, because from the Father through the Son there stands forth into the great Spirit a divinity perfect in perfect ones" ([120]). Carm. I. I, sect. 2, carm. 2, v. 688 (Migne, T. XXXVII, p. 632).

2º From Anastasius—whom Macarius calls "the Sinaite"—in order to demonstrate an explicit denial of a procession from the Son,

---

[119] The Holy Spirit has the Son as principle in respect of origin; but He is without time "with the principle," in respect of eternity. In this same sense Basil, cited above, said: the Son manifests the Spirit "with Himself" and "after Himself."

[120] ᾽Αναρχον, καὶ ἀρχή, καὶ τὸ μετὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς, εἷς θεός... Οὔτε ἡ ἀρχή, τῷ ἀρχὴ εἶναι, τοῦ ἀνάρχου διείργεται... καὶ τὸ μετὰ τοῦ ἀνάρχου καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς, οὐκ ἄλλο τι, ἢ ὅπερ ἐκεῖνα. Ὄνομα δὲ τῷ μὲν ἀνάρχῳ, πατήρ· τῇ δὲ ἀρχῇ, υἱός· τῷ δὲ μετὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς, πνεῦμα ἅγιον.

he has nothing other than that in Oration I on the Trinity, nos. 10–11, he says that the Son and the Holy Spirit are from the Father; nor, therefore, because the Son said of Himself, "I came forth from the Father," and of the Holy Spirit, "who proceeds from the Father," is the difference of the procession of each taken away (Galland. T. XII). All of this has nothing to do with a denial of procession from the Father and the Son; and, in fact, that this doctrine is clearly taught by this Anastasius of Antioch in this very oration is evident from the testimonies set out above (pp. 65–66).

3º From the whole Macarian hotchpotch, therefore, nothing remains beyond the oft-repeated way of speaking of St Maximus and St John of Damascus, who, not without some foundation in certain older Fathers, judged that by the name "cause" and by the preposition "from" (ἐκ), in their most proper signification, the primordial cause is signified; and therefore they held that one must say that the Holy Spirit proceeds not "from the Son as cause," but "from the Father through the Son." Besides these, there are still the writings of Theodoret against St Cyril—condemned on other grounds by anathema in the Fifth Synod—in which, together with his master Theodore of Mopsuestia, he asserts that the Holy Spirit has neither His existence (τὴν ὕπαρξιν) from the Son nor through the Son.

We have demonstrated the Catholic doctrine of Maximus and Damascene in our Treatise, Thesis XXXVI. As for Theodoret: if we concede to Macarius (as very many Catholic authors concede—indeed, even contend) that he is to be understood as denying the procession of the Holy Spirit, then, consistently, we must interpret in that same sense the symbol of Theodore that was adopted by the Nestorians, since from it Theodoret derived not only his opinion but the very words. Since, therefore, Macarius strenuously maintains that this is indeed the sense of Theodoret, we will grant him that the first origin of the Photian doctrine is to be found not in Photius himself,

but in the author of Nestorianism, Theodore, and in his disciples Nestorius and Theodoret. Nevertheless—since it is not "argument against the man," but truth alone and entire, that concerns us—we indicated in Thesis XXXIII, no. II, the probable reasons by which Theodore and his disciple Theodoret can be excused from this heresy.

Macarius (p. 357) argues that the words of that Nestorian symbol—"the Holy Spirit neither is the Son nor has received existence through the Son"—are not about the procession of the Holy Spirit, but merely deny, against the Macedonians, the creation of the Spirit through the Son; then, however (pp. 359, 360, 383), he vehemently contends that those same words in Theodoret—patron of Nestorius against Cyril—"we reject as blasphemous that the Holy Spirit has existence from the Son or through the Son" are to be understood no longer about the creation of the Spirit against the Macedonians, but about the eternal procession "from the Son or through the Son." The purpose of the man—who never considers what truth may have, but only what seems to serve his own cause—is manifest. He would like to remove from his heresy the charge of a Nestorian origin, if it were found first enunciated verbatim in the Nestorian symbol; for prior to this symbol the denial "the Spirit is not through the Son," even to Photian eyes, has thus far not been detected in any document whatsoever, nor does there shine any hope of detecting it after such great exertions. On the other hand, he thinks he can easily palm off the authority of Theodoret as unanswerable; to this end he carefully hushes up the fact that Theodoret's statement never occurs except in writings in which, for the defense of Nestorius, he attacks the Catholic doctrine expressed in the anathemas of Cyril —and so in writings condemned by the whole Church. Although, therefore, we think it cannot—without contradiction—be denied that the same sense is found in Theodore as in his disciple Theodoret; and although, for reasons adduced in their own place, we deem it

probable that in both the discourse is only against the Macedonian doctrine (which Theodoret, with a calumny equal to that of his imputation of Monophysitism to St Cyril, laid to Cyril's charge): namely, that the discussion is about the creation, not about the procession, of the Holy Spirit "through the Son"—still, for dogma nothing, and for the history of heresy not much, turns upon this. Whether Theodore or Theodoret—or both—was the author of the Photian denial, its swaddling clothes will be Nestorian, since not only the writings of Theodore but also those of Theodoret, in which that denial is presupposed, belong to Nestorianism and are branded with anathema.

§ VIII.
On the Western Fathers Who are Cited as if They were Explicit Vindicators of the Photian Doctrine

Out of the Western Fathers, the adversary dares to parade, for an explicit—or equivalent—denial of a procession from the Son, Augustine, Vigilius of Thapsus, and Fulgentius, who, in passages which, for the most part, he has himself corrupted by truncation and a topsy-turvy translation, defend nothing other than the common doctrine against the Arians: that the Spirit proceeds from the Father. Of this man's impudence we spoke in Thesis XXXV, no. II. To these he adds Mansuetus of Milan, around whom he wraps a certain marvelous argument of his own. Listen to the Photian fable.

In the letter which, in the year 679, Damian of Ticinum—later a bishop—wrote in the name of Mansuetus and of the synod of Milan to Constantine Pogonatus, there is inserted a profession of faith against the Monothelites. In the first part of this profession, insisting against the Arians, there is affirmed the unity of the divine essence in three distinct Persons, whose names do not signify a

different nature—as the Arians said "more excellent," "lesser," and "inferior"—but designate the relations of consubstantial Persons to one another; and therefore, just as the Father is referred to the Son and the Son to the Father, so too the name "Spirit" is relative, and hence signifies what the Pneumatomachi among the Arians and Semi-Arians denied: that the Spirit is "from the Father." For when we say "almighty Father," the application of this paternal name is directed to the Person of the Son; and when we say "eternal Son," it is referred to the Person of the eternal Father; and when we name the Holy Spirit, we show that He proceeds from the Person of the eternal Father (Mansi, Concil., T. XI, p. 206; Migne, Patrologia Latina, T. LXXXVII, p. 1265). Now how, I ask, did Macarius find in this Catholic profession the Photian denial? "If the Holy Spirit," says he, "proceeds from the Person or hypostasis of the eternal Father; and if the hypostasis of the Father is entirely distinct and separate (sic) from the hypostasis of the Son—although they are one in essence—([121]); the Spirit does not proceed from the Son, otherwise the hypostases would be confused." Macarius, p. 387.

Nothing could be more suitable than arguments of this kind —which recur often among the Photians—for understanding how, in the doctrine of the Most Holy Trinity, the several articles cohere intimately, and how, if even a single particle be denied, the whole principal mystery of the Christian faith is perverted. If the hypostases

---

[121] « Mais si... l'hypostase du Père soit tout à fait distincte et separée de celle du Fils, bien qu'ils ne soient qu'un par essence. » — The divine hypostases are indeed distinguished from one another, and not only by a distinction of reason—as in the case of absolute attributes—but by a real distinction; and therefore they are to be called, and in this same profession of the bishops of Milan they are called, "distinct and discrete persons." But no one except a Tritheist can say that the Persons, although they are one in essence, are "entirely separate" from one another.

of the Father and of the Son are "entirely separate" from each other, and consequently the unity of essence and of all the attributes is not numerical (that is, of singularity), but, as between two angels or two men, the unity of essence is merely specific; then, in this Tritheist hypothesis—and only in this hypothesis—it is most true that from the fact that the Spirit proceeds from the Person of the Father, it in no way follows that He likewise proceeds from the Person of the Son. Indeed, just as in that doctrine of the Tritheists the operation ad extra —for example, creation—could not be conceived as the one numerically identical operation of three Persons, nor could the Persons be one numerically identical principle of creation, but there would be three creators; so also, in that absurd doctrine, the Father and the Son could not be conceived as one spirator, or one principle of spiration, in relation to the Third Person. But if the Person of the Father and the Person of the Son—as the Catholic faith teaches, and as even the Photians admit whenever they have no need to defend their heresy—are constituted as distinct from one another only by the formal notion of paternity and of filiation, while in all other respects they are absolutely one in number; then, in this fundamental Catholic doctrine, the one who confesses the Person of the Father to be the principle of the Holy Spirit, by that very fact confesses equally that the Person of the Son, by one numerically identical spiration, is the principle of the same Spirit. For by spiration the First and Second Persons are neither constituted nor distinguished from each other—precisely as the one who confesses the Person of the Father to be "God almighty" confesses equally the Person of the Son and of the Holy Spirit to be "God almighty," by one numerically identical

divinity and omnipotence, since divinity and omnipotence are not distinguishing notes but are common to the three Persons (122).

Let us now consider the Photian argument, once the Tritheist foundation of the "separation" of Persons has been cut away, and let us see what could legitimately be inferred in it. "If," says Macarius, "the Spirit proceeds from the Person of the Father, and this Person is distinct from the Person of the Son; then the Spirit does not proceed from the Son—otherwise the Father and the Son would not be distinct Persons" (123). Indeed, the conclusion would have to be formed thus: if the Spirit proceeds from the Person of the Father, formally as He is Father, then the Spirit would be generated and would be the Son; but since the Father, in the formal notion of "Father," is related to one Son only, the Son and the Spirit would not be distinct Persons, but would be one Person generated by the Father, who under a double name would now be called "Son," now "Spirit." If, however, the Spirit is not generated, then by that very fact He does not proceed from the First Person as She is formally "Father" in relation to the Son. But it is by this relation alone, and by the formal notion of "Father," that the First Person is distinguished as "Father" from the Second Person "Son"; therefore the Spirit, the Third Person, does not proceed from the First Person inasmuch as She is distinguished from the Second Person, but absolutely insofar as the Father and the Son are one in spiration—by which they are not

---

122 This example is appended in this same profession of Mansuetus: "Cum autem dicimus Deum Patrem omnipotentem, non potest huius nominis evacuari sacramentum, quia cum dicimus Patrem, Filium demonstramus, et cum dicimus Filium, Patrem declaramus."

123 « Si c'est de la personne ou de l'hypostase du Père éternel que procède le S. Esprit... l'Esprit ne procède donc pas du Fils; autrement les hypostases du Père et du Fils seraient confondues. »

referred to one another, but, as one principle, to the Third Person, the Holy Spirit.

Therefore, what the Photians say—"If the Spirit, just as He proceeds from the Person of the Father, likewise proceeded from the Person of the Son, then the Persons of the Father and the Son would not be distinct"—contains both a fraudulent dissimulation and distortion of Catholic doctrine, and a childish trifling against the discipline of logic. First, they suppose that Catholics say the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son under the formal notion by which the two Persons are distinguished from one another; whereas, on the contrary, we profess that the Spirit proceeds under the formal notion of spiration, by which the Father and the Son are one with one another, and, as one principle, are distinguished from the Third Person proceeding. The trifling—indeed an evident nugation and a new heresy—lies in this: that they say, and for the sake of the Photian dogma are compelled to say, "If the Persons of the Father and of the Son are not distinguished from each other by spiration, then they are not distinguished in any way."

Although operative power ad extra—as an absolute attribute—and spirative power—as relative to the Third Person—are certainly different, yet, with respect to the unity of the former in three Persons and of the latter in two Persons, the rationale is the same, as St Augustine already noted (De Trinitate, Book V, nos. 14–15). Hence the Macarian syllogism and the Socinian syllogism have the same force. The Socinians say: the Person of the Father is really distinct from the Person of the Son; but the world was created by the Person of the Father; therefore it was not created by the Person of the Son. Macarius argues thus: the Person of the Father is really distinct from the Person of the Son; but the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Person of the Father—as Mansuetus teaches, indeed he ought to have said, as the Catholic faith teaches; therefore the Holy Spirit does not proceed

from the Person of the Son. In both syllogisms there is an equal petitio principii: for there is presupposed as a conceded principle of the demonstration precisely what we deny as heresy and what the opponents would have to prove. Just as the Socinian assumes the creative power to be proper to the Person of the Father alone, so the Photian assumes the spirative power to be proper to the Person of the Father alone, and thus that the two Persons are distinguished by it. But just as the three Persons, by the creative power, are not referred to one another—and therefore that power is one and common in the three—so the Person of the Father and the Person of the Son are not referred one to the other by the power and act of spiration; and by this very fact spiration is one and common to the Father and the Son, in a real relation to the Holy Spirit. To both syllogisms, therefore, one and the same response applies entirely. I distinguish the major: the Persons of the Father and of the Son are really distinguished by the relation of paternity and filiation, by which they are referred to one another as Begetter and Begotten—granted; they are distinguished by creative or spirative power—denied. Likewise I distinguish the minor: the world was created by the Person of the Father, in that the Father, with the Son, is one Creator by omnipotent power—which, in the Father incommunicably one and the same, is in the Son communicated; and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Person of the Father, in that the Father, with the Son, is one Spirator by spirative power—which is one in Him incommunicably, and in the Son communicated by Him—granted; the world was created, or the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Person of the Father, under the formal notion by which the Father is the Begetter of the Son, and by which alone He is really distinguished from the Son—denied. Therefore (the conclusion is to be drawn): just as—even to the Photians' own admission—by the very fact that the Person of the Father is called "God almighty," it is understood that the Father and the Son and the

Holy Spirit are one "God almighty," so by precisely the same necessary consequence it is understood that the Father and the Son are one Spirator in relation to the Holy Spirit, whenever not only Mansuetus but Scripture, the symbols, the Fathers, and all Catholic doctors preach that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Person of the Father.

Who, then, remain to Macarius from the Western Fathers of his fourth class, whom he has dared to calumniate as assertors of the Photian heresy? He names still Rusticus, a schismatic deacon of the Roman Church, and Anastasius, the Librarian—contemporary with Photius and bound to him by friendship. If the matter be considered dogmatically, we could surely, with many Catholic theologians and without detriment, concede that neither writer had a sufficiently thorough grasp of Catholic doctrine—since Rusticus, a defender of the "Three Chapters," looked at least toward the ambiguous statements of his client Theodoret, while Anastasius perhaps attempted some excuse for his friend Photius. How, however, Rusticus is to be judged as having hesitated only with respect to a subtler mode of understanding, and how Anastasius is to be regarded as having said the same thing as St Maximus concerning the procession of the Spirit "from the Father through the Son," I have set forth in Thesis XXXVI, no. II, and Thesis XXXVIII, no. II.

SECTION III.

ON THE PROFESSION OF THE PROCESSION FROM THE FATHER AND THE SON AS EXPRESSED IN THE CREED

Although in our Treatise, Thesis XLI, we have sufficiently demonstrated the genuine sense of the Ephesian decree issued against the Nestorian creed, nevertheless the aim of the present study requires an examination of the arguments with which, following Adam Zoernikaw and Theophan Prokopowicz, Macarius, in his Introduction à la Theologie orthodoxe ([124]) pp. 579 ff., set about defending the absurd interpretation of Mark of Ephesus and other ancient schismatics—an interpretation according to which, even if the truth of this article were granted, its insertion into the Creed would nonetheless have been condemned beforehand.

Macarius tries to prove that by that decree the Council of Ephesus absolutely forbade any addition to the Constantin-opolitan Creed, even of true and revealed doctrine, and that therefore, by the very insertion of the particle Filioque into that Creed, the Latin Church ceased to be the true Church. He alleges as proof: Cyril's

---

[124] Introduction *à la Theologie orthodoxe de Macaire Evêque de Vinnitza etc.*

letter to John of Antioch; the Council of Chalcedon, in which the same letter was approved; the profession of faith of the Emperor Justinian; the letter of Agatho, the Roman Pontiff, to Emperor Constantine Pogonatus; Alcuin's letter to the brethren of Lyons; the Council of Friuli under Paulinus; the dealings of Pope Leo III with the legates of Charlemagne; and the synod of the year 867, which (he says), celebrated with the Roman legates present and concurring, long enjoyed authority in the East as if it were an eighth ecumenical council.

As to the Synod of Friuli—held in the realm of Charlemagne chiefly to defend the insertion of the particle Filioque in the Creed, as it had already for some time prevailed in the churches of Charlemagne's kingdoms—and as to the judgment of Leo III, there is no need to speak; for in the cited Thesis XLI, and, with regard to Pope Leo, even above in this little work, the frauds of the Photians have been sufficiently uncovered and refuted. It remains, therefore, that we examine the other documents adduced by Macarius.

2) If you look a little more carefully and compare with one another what Macarius argues in that Introduction to Orthodox Theology concerning the notes of the true Church, you will see that the notes about which this impostor shows himself most solicitous are ultimately reduced to two negations. He reaches his purpose by, as it were, three steps. First, together with the Protestants, he sets as the sole note of the true Church the truth of doctrine: "the Orthodox Church is the one that truly and unchangeably preserves the infallible doctrine of the ancient ecumenical Church." Certainly, no one who admits that Catholic revelation is objectively absolute through Christ and through the Holy Spirit in the Apostles denies the truth of this principle; yet no one in his right mind can take it as a note by which each person may distinguish the true Church of Christ among the counterfeit churches, all of which boast that they are marked by this

property. Indeed, this is precisely what is sought by means of the notes: namely, which Church now preserves the entire infallible doctrine and all the institutions of the Church founded of old by Christ and propagated through the Apostles.

Macarius saw this, and therefore, as a second step, he further explicates his "note." The true Church, he says, is that which preserves the Constantinopolitan Creed and the definitions of the ecumenical councils, in all fundamental articles, without diminution and without addition, and which with full right confirms all its dogmas by the unanimous doctrine of the holy Fathers. "It is well known that the ecumenical Church made its infallible voice heard on all the principal articles of the faith in the ecumenical councils, particularly in the Creed of Nicaea and of Constantinople, and in other decrees concerning certain dogmas... Hence the first partial principle: the name 'Orthodox Church' must belong exclusively to that among the existing churches which has preserved intact—adding nothing to it and taking nothing from it—this infinitely sacred rule... The second partial principle: that one among all the existing churches which can, and does with good right, base all the dogmas it professes upon the unanimous belief of the holy Fathers or of all ancient Christendom—that one alone is truly the Orthodox Church." But this second point is clearly not to be considered a "note" of the Church, since by the notes we seek the true Church, from whose authority we are then made certain concerning the antiquity and truth of the whole doctrine; it is not the case that, by an examination of the entire doctrine—an examination that would have to be independent of the authority of the Church not yet recognized—individuals can arrive at a knowledge of the true Church.

As for the former "partial principle," do not ask how the true Church did not already lose that note in the Second Council, where it added many things to the Creed that had been in use up to that

point; how it did not perish by the addition of definitions in all the subsequent councils; how the addition of definitions of doctrine could have been, and in fact was, made up to the Seventh Council, in the eighth century, whereas thereafter the addition of a definition of revealed dogmas would destroy the note of the true Church; how we are made certain that those seven councils are all ecumenical and that none of the later ones is ecumenical, although in the latter all the characteristics of a universal council shine forth much more splendidly than in some of the earlier—for example, in the First Council of Constantinople. Do not ask these things, I say. For Macarius thinks that these two partial principles, under the name of "notes" of the Church, are necessary and sufficient for him to show that the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Roman Church is not the true Church.

But lest it should come into the mind of any of his pupils, on the basis of these principles, to conduct an examination of the definitions of the councils and of the unanimous doctrine of the ancient Fathers—not from schismatics' books but from the genuine sources—he forestalls attempts of this sort, which, once their impostures were exposed, would easily lead to the Catholic Church. "To suppose that there could be in the Orthodox Church (i.e., the imperial Russian Church) dogmas that would not accord with the ancient doctrine of the holy Fathers is likewise impossible, since it is well known that this Church alone today remains faithful to the ancient ecumenical councils," p. 594. Since, however, no mortal will have understood how, if someone professes the dogmas defined in seven councils, he thereby holds the whole doctrine of the holy Fathers (for in this doctrine of the Fathers there can be, and in fact are, articles about which the councils did not treat—for example, about the seven sacraments and many other matters), in order to conceal this difficulty from the minds of the schismatics Macarius had

already prearranged the Protestant system of "fundamental articles" ("the principal articles"). But if the fundamental and necessary articles are only those that are found defined in the seven councils, will it then be permissible for the Russians to deny all those matters which, for instance, concerning the seven sacraments, the canonical books, the beatific vision, the eternity of punishments, and many others, were neither treated nor defined there?

Moreover, how, I ask, can it seem "well known" to anyone that the schismatic Church alone persists faithful to the ancient councils, when the question concerns not the material words but the meaning of the councils? And indeed it is not "well known" but is precisely the question whether, for example, in the profession of the First Council of Constantinople the true sense is that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father in such wise that the Father, in the spiration, is one with the Son, or rather that procession from the Son is denied. Macarius forbids the Russians to inquire into this, because he looks only at the material words—credo in Spiritum Sanctum, qui a Patre procedit—as they are retained without explanation in their Creed; just as, generally speaking, the schismatics, together with the synagogue of the Jews, in matters of faith and morals are concerned not so much with spirit and power as with flesh and letter. By this very approach the Photian prepares for himself the way to the third step, by which to establish his "note" of the true Church.

For after the note of the Church has been reduced to the faithful retention of the ancient (seven) councils—a note of truth which, accordingly, before the Council of Nicaea the Church did not have at all, and afterwards received now this and now that from succeeding councils—there now arises the question how this faithful retention of the ancient councils, as a note of truth, does not belong to the Catholic Church. From his Judaizing principle, by which the sum of the matter consists in material words rather than in the

explanation and sense of the words, Macarius, through many windings, finally descends at the third step to the ultimate expression for which the whole machine had been constructed: fidelity in the retention of the Creed, of synodal definitions, and of the unanimous doctrine of the Fathers must be so understood that the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son and the primacy of the Roman Pontiff are denied. In the end, therefore, the "note" of the true Church—so far as it is set in opposition to the Catholic Church, which alone (after the fashion of all heretics) Macarius attacks—is contained in this twofold negation: the "Orthodox Church" is that which denies the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son and the primacy of the Roman Pontiff.

You can now gather, if you please, with what great frauds a man must necessarily proceed who, together with that twofold negation, explicitly professes these three things: (a) He grants, and is compelled to grant, that at least down to the ninth century the Roman Church was the true Church; to it, therefore, that same twofold negation must be ascribed as the proper character of the true Church. (b) He professes that the true Church is infallible in teaching and believing; whence it is necessary to demonstrate that the whole Church of the West and of the East, down to the ninth century, explicitly taught and believed both of those dogmas of Photian negation. For we are dealing with a dogma characteristic of the true Church and thus, being explicitly believed and taught in every age, it follows that all those who up to the ninth century taught either the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son or the primacy of the Roman Pontiff must be judged to have been cast out from the Church and manifest heretics. (c) Macarius protests that Tradition no less than Scripture is the treasury in which the entire deposit of faith is contained. Hence his task is to show that in the documents of Tradition down to the ninth century the affirmation of

each of those two dogmas is not contained, but that in the consensus of the documents the negation of each is contained. In very truth, Macarius undertakes to demonstrate to his Russians all these things—which would appear evidently absurd to any person who has ever examined, even at first glance, the documents of antiquity and ecclesiastical history. Who, then, will wonder that this impostor, like the other Photians, in the perversion, truncation, concealment, and denial of documents and texts, had need of deceits greater than those of the Protestants themselves, who simply deny the authority of the Church and of Tradition? As for these deceits with respect to the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit, we have sufficiently demonstrated them in our Treatise and in the present pamphlet; but concerning the dogma of primacy—against which he, if it be possible, lies yet more brazenly—this is not the moment for us to speak. Consult the learned Fr. Jean Gagarin's dissertation De l'enseignement de la théologie dans l'Église russe (Études par les PP. Daniel et Gagarin, T. I, p. I ff.), and the other, "Les starovères, l'Église russe et le Pape" (ibid. T. II, p. 3 ff.).

CHAPTER I.

ON THE CATHOLIC TESTIMONIES ADDUCED BY MACARIUS

1º From Cyril's Letter 34 to John of Antioch he cites the following in order to prove his thesis: "In no way do we allow the faith that has been defined, that is, the symbol of faith which was once issued by our holy Fathers assembled at Nicaea, to be shaken by anyone. Nor do we permit either ourselves or others to change even a single word among the things contained there, or to transgress a

single syllable ([125]), remembering him who said: 'Do not move the ancient landmarks that your fathers set.'" Cyril, vol. V, p. 108.

If Macarius was pleased to proceed sophistically, he could have found something more to his purpose in Cyril—for example, in Letter 35, p. 113, to Acacius of Melitene; for from the words he himself has quoted, even if the context and purpose be not considered and the words be taken abruptly, no one can hammer out even the semblance of an argument. Our adversary will not deny that the words and syllables in the place cited must be understood according to the sense that underlies them, since he himself recites the Creed in the liturgy not in Greek words and syllables but in Slavonic ones. Granted this, Cyril is saying nothing other than what all Catholics hold, which in the end coincides with the very infallibility of the Church's definitions. Precisely because definitions of dogmas are infallible, they are also irreformable—so much so that neither we, nor others, nor even the whole Church may lawfully change into a different, contrary, or divergent sense the meaning contained in the words and syllables of the definitions, in such wise that the sense of the prior definition would seem to be disapproved and eliminated. (See the holy Ecumenical Vatican Council, sess. 3, ch. 4, can. 3, De fide et ratione.) Now this irreformable perpetuity of the truth, from the very nature of the case, holds as much in the words and syllables of the Creed, of which Cyril speaks, as in all other definitions of doctrine authentically proposed by the Church.

But in order that the genuine meaning of those words of Cyril may be understood more distinctly, the purpose and the context must be considered. The matter at hand was the composition of peace

---

[125] Κατ' οὐδένα δὲ τρόπον σαλεύεσθαι πρὸς τινῶν ἀνεχόμεθα τὴν ὁρισθεῖσαν πίστιν, ἤτοι τὸ τῆς πίστεως σύμβολον παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἡμῶν πατέρων τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνελθόντων κατὰ καιρούς· οὔτε μὴν ἐπιτρέπομεν ἑαυτοῖς ἢ ἑτέροις ἢ λέξιν ἀμεῖψαι τῶν ἐγκειμένων ἐκεῖσε, ἢ μίαν παραβῆναι συλλαβήν.

with John of Antioch and the other Eastern bishops who, as favorers of Nestorius in the Council of Ephesus, had brought about a schism. In these negotiations for peace the Orientals at first made the absurd demand that, for reconciling unity, the Ephesian definitions be set aside and nothing else be required than a profession of the Nicene Creed; for this, they said, sufficed against all heresies. They complained that Cyril, in his letters and anathemas against Nestorius, had handed on the heresies of Apollinaris, Arius, and Eunomius, and that therefore he himself, and the Synod of Ephesus agreeing with him, had perverted the definition expressed in the Nicene Creed. To these calumnies Cyril—in his Letters 33, 39, 40, 48, 55, 69, 70 (ed. Migne, Patrologia Graeca, vol. LXXVII)—always replies to the same effect: that he holds the Nicene symbol in its entirety, in the genuine sense declared by the Fathers; that, if it is explained in this sense, it certainly suffices against heresies; that Nestorius perverts this very sense; that therefore against that heretic the Fathers at Ephesus again confirmed the Nicene symbol; for "it is not a matter of adding to it, nor of taking away from it," in the way, namely, that Nestorius both added and subtracted; hence, too, that for granting communion to the Orientals it is by no means sufficient that they retain the Nicene symbol, but it is further necessary that they also agree with what was defined at Ephesus. Accordingly, everything that Cyril says about the Nicene symbol is referred to an apologia against the calumny by which he was accused of perverting the symbol into a heretical sense, and to the accusation of Nestorius, who was guilty of such a heretical perversion; and to both ends, while this dispute with the Orientals was pending, he also wrote and sent to the Emperor Theodosius a lengthy exposition of the Nicene symbol, which is included among the letters (55th in Migne's edition, 47th in Aubert's). Therefore the holy bishop of Alexandria contends and proves one thing only: that it is unlawful for anyone to alter and pervert the Nicene faith—that is,

the sense of the dogmas which are contained in the symbol, whether explicitly or implicitly—by addition or subtraction or false interpretation.

As St. Cyril himself testifies that already at Ephesus Nestorius wanted the sole purpose of the Council to be this: by common decree to ratify the faith of the holy Fathers gathered at Nicaea; "for many synods held after that one presumed to innovate nothing against it, but enacted that it must be adhered to" (Mansi V, p. 768). Then the little synod of John of Antioch, acting schismatically at Ephesus against the ecumenical council, condemned Cyril's chapters as tainted with the heresy of Apollinaris, "without any other definition than that of the Nicene faith," for "the confession of those few words of the right faith," they say, "is sufficient both to convict every heretical error and to instruct those who wish for the truth" (ibid., p. 783). These schismatics say that the emperors had ordered "that we should be content with that which in Nicaea was set forth by our most holy Fathers"—casting aside, of course, "those scandals which have lately arisen (by means of Cyril)"; "whence too we attempted to persuade those bishops who do not reject the things that are Egyptian (Cyril's), and who subscribed to the chapters set forth by him as being heretical, that they should remove those things which are openly contrary to the orthodox faith, and be content with the exposition which was made at Nicaea, according to the ordinance of the most pious princes. But since we were in no way able to persuade them... we who abide in the sound faith and do not allow anything alien to be smuggled into it (namely, the chapters of Cyril) have been compelled to set forth this in writing..." "For the exposition of these words, few though they are, is sufficient both to teach the integrity of piety and to show the path of truth and to refute the madness of heretical error." Then, after appending the entire Nicene symbol: "In this exposition of the faith," they say, "we all confess that

we persevere..." "But the heretical chapters which have lately been set forth by Cyril, to which he also subjoined superfluous and vain anathemas, and which he moreover tried to establish by a varied decree and by the subscription of the bishops (of the Council of Ephesus)—these things, therefore, the holy synod (the schismatic synagogue) which has assembled in Ephesus alienates from the orthodox faith" (ibid., p. 790). These same patrons of Nestorius, about retaining the Nicene symbol alone and against the doctrine of Cyril and of the true Council of Ephesus, repeat the same in all their letters—to one another, to the Count Irenaeus, to the emperor. "It is impossible," they say, "for us to make another exposition of faith than that which was made in Nicaea by the most blessed Fathers" (ibid., p. 795; cf. pp. 794, 798, 799, 803, 805, 814, 824, passim). They complain that this symbol of faith was corrupted by Cyril and the Fathers of Ephesus agreeing with him. "Those who deposed him (Nestorius), in the very proceedings of the heretics, conjoined the heretical chapters with the faith of the Fathers (of Nicaea), as you know; and by this denoting themselves as heretics and alien from the orthodox faith" (ibid., p. 796). What sort of heresy this of Cyril and the Fathers of Ephesus is, they set out to the Emperor Theodosius at length: "The Body of the Church will be cut asunder if the sense introduced by Cyril, superinduced upon the (Nicene) faith and confirmed by other heretics, should prevail... We deem it necessary hence to instruct your empire, because those who are mixed with those heresiarchs (Apollinaris, Arius, and Eunomius) are teaching in the Churches the things that belong to Apollinaris and Arius and Eunomius" (ibid., p. 809).

After the Council, when the emperor tried to abolish the schism, they at first persisted in the same obstinacy. Accordingly, having held a synod at Antioch, they wrote these conditions of peace to Cyril: "We remain in the faith of the holy Fathers who met in

Nicaea... But the dogmas lately superinduced, or by means of chapters —which disturb things in common—we reject, being content with the ancient legislation of the Fathers, and following him who said: 'Do not move the eternal landmarks that your fathers set'" (ibid., p. 829).

In his reply to these propositions of the Orientals (which is Letter 33 in Migne's ed.; Mansi, ibid., p. 831), and in all the other letters which I indicated, Cyril declares those points the sum of which I have described in the text. His words in Letter 33 are: "Since he (John of Antioch with his associates) truly says that one must be in agreement with the symbol or certainly with the exposition of faith of the three hundred and eighteen, I in reply say this: that the one intention of the holy and universal synod, which assembled in the metropolis of Ephesus, was to confirm the symbol, to the end that all should confess and believe and teach thus, with neither anything added nor anything taken away; for neither is it a matter of adding to it nor of taking away from it (in confessing, believing, and teaching; for Cyril was concerned not with the formula considered materially, but universally with the profession and doctrine of faith). For this reason it also decreed against Nestorius, as one who did not recommend it, but rather removed and obliterated it and in no way whatever followed it (who nevertheless at Ephesus strove with all his might that there should be simply a remaining in the Nicene symbol considered materially), and as one who insanely sounded in the ears of the people a certain other thing, foreign to the dogmas of the Church. Therefore, in Ephesus, there was a proper record made in the proceedings concerning this point (against those things foreign to the dogmas of the Church), the synod confirming the faith set forth by our three hundred and eighteen Fathers who were assembled in Nicaea in their time... Moreover, we added (in the Council of Ephesus) also the testimonies of holy and blessed Fathers, so that

those approaching might know how those who initiated us into the mysteries also understood the symbol of faith (for it is not about the words that the matter is at issue—which words even Nestorius said must be retained—but about the sense of the dogmas)... Nor let those who are alienating and inconsiderate vomit out against us simple words, slandering me as favoring the things of Apollinaris or Arius or Eunomius, as they wrote in Ephesus (in their schismatic little council)... In the things that we have written, as we are attacking the dogmas of Nestorius, there is absolutely nothing that is at odds either with the holy Scriptures or certainly with the definition of faith that was set forth by the Fathers—by which I mean those who in their time were assembled in Nicaea. Our intention therefore is aimed at peace—not at attacking the things that have been defined—provided, namely, that they be willing to consent to the deposition of Nestorius and to anathematize his dogmas... But to those who say that the things which we have written against the filthy dogmas of Nestorius must be cast out, no one will acquiesce."

But Macarius, who foists upon St. Cyril an absurd meaning, as though he had said it is absolutely unlawful—even with the sense of the dogmas preserved and for the sake of explaining revealed truth—to add a word or a syllable to the symbol, plainly subjects himself and all the Photians to Cyril's anathemas. For wherever Cyril forbids "even a single word or syllable of the symbol to be changed or transgressed," he is always speaking of the Nicene formula, which he sets out whole and interprets in the commentary already mentioned (Letter 47 [=55]). Yet Macarius and the rest of the Photians, while they adopt the Constantinopolitan formula, insert not only a word and a syllable but whole sentences—and among them that one, qui a Patre procedit ("who proceeds from the Father")—and remove others, into and from that symbol to which, according to Macarius's

reading of St. Cyril, it would not be lawful for any Christian to add or subtract even a single word or syllable.

Nor let Macarius reply that these additions and subtractions were made by an ecumenical council and therefore legitimately, at a time when the Ephesian prohibition did not yet exist. For:

a) The Photians contend that even for the whole Church and for ecumenical councils it is not lawful to add anything—even if most true—to the symbol, in the same way that additions to inspired Scripture would be nefarious interpolations, as I showed by citing the schismatics' own words in Thesis XLI, no. 3.

b) Cyril most certainly denies to himself and to others—whoever they might be—even to an ecumenical council, the power to introduce those changes of words and syllables of which he alone is speaking. Just as later the Monophysites accused Pope Leo and the Council of Chalcedon of having violated the symbol (see the cited Thesis, no. 2), so the Orientals favoring Nestorius, with whom Cyril had the controversy, complained that the Nicene symbol had been altered by the Ephesian Council—not, to be sure, by additions in the formula itself, but by definitions contrary to the symbol—and therefore they demanded that, for the reconciliation of peace, the one watchword retained should be the Nicene faith, with the chapters or anathemas of Cyril and the Ephesian definitions abolished. Against these charges, in all the letters cited Cyril replies that both the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus and he himself knew perfectly well that changes of this sort—namely, contrary ones—even in a single word or syllable, are permitted to no one; indeed, that the Fathers at Ephesus, because they thought thus, therefore proscribed the Nestorian exposition of the faith (the symbol promulgated by Charisius) as contrary to the truth of the Nicene definition, and in the same sense forbade the writing of "another faith," by which the Nicene faith would be perverted.

c) Hence it is evident, as I said a little earlier, that Cyril is not treating of the force of the Ephesian decree in a disciplinary sense; rather, he argues dogmatically, from the intrinsic immutability of the Nicene faith—which faith is Catholic—that it was and always will be unlawful for all Christians and at all times, and thus also for the Fathers, as much at Ephesus as at Constantinople, to transgress even a single syllable in the Nicene symbol, whether by addition, subtraction, or an interpretation contrary to a faith once defined.

d) Whence, when Macarius transfers everything that Cyril argues against contrary changes to explanations that are true and inserted into the symbol, it follows, from the very opinion which he attributes to Cyril, that any other formula—thus, the Constantinopolitan one—in which, when compared with the Nicene symbol, there are found additions and subtractions, must be held condemned, whether among those many additions there is the simpler one against the Macedonians, qui a Patre procedit ("who proceeds from the Father"), or the more explicit one, qui a Patre Filioque procedit ("who proceeds from the Father and the Son"), neither of which stands in the Nicene Creed, which professes only this one thing: "(We believe) also in the Holy Spirit." If Macarius himself feels that these things are absurd, he will perceive the absurdity of his own interpretation of the Cyrilline and Ephesian doctrine.

2º What has already been said likewise answers the argument that Macarius tries to wring from the Council of Chalcedon, which (so he says), by confirming the letters of Cyril, ratified his explanation of the sense of the Ephesian decree. Exactly as at Ephesus John of Antioch with his Orientals, and Nestorius himself, so at Chalcedon Dioscorus and the other defenders of Eutyches regarded the Nicene symbol in a Photian, merely material sense; and in this sense, in order to avoid the condemnation of their heresy, they shouted that any

additions whatsoever were forbidden by the Ephesian decree, and that this one symbol sufficed as the watchword of orthodox faith. Whence the Fathers at Chalcedon were constrained, against these heretical evasions, to declare the Ephesian decree itself: "He (Dioscorus) deceitfully presented the Synod of the holy Fathers (Ephesus); for it (the Nicene symbol) took additions on account of the perverse understanding of the heretics." Not an explanation of dogmas that is more explicit is prohibited; rather, the contrary errors of the heretics are proscribed. "For every law restrains the unjust from crimes; it does not sever judges from their power; because even now it is lawful that, whenever an ambiguity in a question arises, we accommodate our confession to the interpretations of the Fathers." See these points demonstrated more distinctly in our cited Thesis XLI, no. 2.

Accordingly, two opinions about the immutability of the Nicene symbol were already set forth in Ephesus itself and in the Council of Chalcedon. There were those who contended that the formula itself, taken materially, had to be retained immutably without any addition—true or false. This Nestorius himself tried with all his might to achieve, as did John of Antioch and the other Oriental schismatics, and later Eutyches and Dioscorus with their patrons of the Monophysite heresy. The Fathers, however—both those of Ephesus (as is most manifest, especially from Cyril's declarations) and those of Chalcedon—took their stand against these heretics by looking to the very sense of the symbol, and they declared that this sense remains perpetually immutable; for "the word of the Lord remains forever." Therefore, on the one hand, they proscribed additions and interpretations that pervert the sense of defined dogmas; on the other hand, they declared that new explanations of the true sense—whether in the symbol itself (as was done at Constantinople) or by definitions equivalent to the symbol (as was done at Ephesus and Chalcedon)—are not only permitted but, by

reason of the office of the Church as guardian of the faith, also necessary against new errors that arise. This same opinion—consonant with the very nature of faith and of the Church, and with the theory and practice of the councils—we Catholics defend against the Photians; whereas the other opinion (at least as regards explanations in the symbol itself) the Photians, in opposition to the Catholic Church, borrowed from ancient heretics and schismatics, and they chant to us that line of Eutyches and Dioscorus: "The universal synod, whose president was Cyril (as those heretics said), issued a definition, that whoever adds anything beyond that faith (the Nicene symbol) is liable to the condemnations which were then written."

Note: Let there be an assessment, please, of the turgid and truly ridiculous declamations of Photius who, in his Mystagogy on the Holy Spirit, boasts that the Roman Pontiffs—Damasus, Celestine, Leo I, Vigilius, Agatho—were patrons of his heresy for no other reason than that they confirmed Councils II–VI, in which, to be sure, the symbol without the particle Filioque was received, and that, beginning at Ephesus and in the councils that followed, it was forbidden "to write another faith." With equal absurdity the heresiarch appeals to Popes Gregory the Great and Zachary: the former wrote, and the latter translated into Greek, the Dialogues, where in II.38 (as also often elsewhere) Gregory explicitly professes: "because the Paraclete Spirit proceeds always from the Father and the Son"; but the Greeks, for their part, altered Zachary's translation—if not to the heretical sense of Photius, as he would have it, yet certainly to a less explicit wording: "because the Paraclete Spirit proceeds from the Father and abides in the Son" (ὅτι τὸ παράκλητον πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς προέρχεται καὶ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ διαμένει). This corruption was already thrown in the Greeks' teeth by John the Deacon (Vita b. Gregorii IV.75) and later by Hugo Etherianus (III.21). But even the Greek

words, as Photius reads them, provide no foundation for his declamation by which he boasts that Gregory and Zachary—and consequently (as he says) all the intervening popes—were asserters of his opinion. The same holds for Leo (III or IV), Benedict III, John VIII, Adrian III: about these he produces, and could produce, nothing other than that they believed in the procession of the Spirit from the Father—at a time when as yet, in the Roman Church, the explicit profession of procession from the Son had not been inserted into the Constantinopolitan symbol. It is truly astonishing that Macarius (p. 317) even now dares to cite that absurd letter to Photius falsely ascribed to John VIII, in which the Pontiff—so as to obtain the favor of "the most holy and Catholic Photius"—perjures himself, saying that he "will place with the Jews all who have dared to add the particle Filioque to the symbol," and that "this very doctrine" (which John had professed at his consecration along with his predecessors) "is blasphemy"; and at the same time he protests that he will compel no one by force to abandon that addition. This fabrication of a letter (Mansi XVII, p. 523) had not yet been forged—or at least, from awareness of the fraud, was concealed by Photius himself—at the time when he wrote his Mystagogy, some while after the death of John and even of his successor Adrian III. (See Photius, Mystagogia, nn. 78–89, with the notes of the learned editor Hergenröther, and the same author's notable Historia Photii, vol. II, p. 541 sqq.)

3° It is difficult to say what Macarius intends, for his absolute immutability of the Nicene formula, by appealing to the profession of faith of the Emperor Justinian. First, the emperor says that he thought it necessary to make manifest in the present edict "the confession of the right faith (τὴν τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως ὁμολογίαν) which is preached in the holy Church of God." Then there follows an exposition of faith: concerning the Most Holy Trinity, and at great length concerning the Incarnation, with the definitions of the councils and the statements of

the Fathers—Athanasius, both Gregories (Nazianzen and of Nyssa), and Cyril—adduced. Third, he warns that this confession of faith is none other than that handed on by Christ, preached by the Apostles, defined by the Nicene Fathers against Arius in the symbol, explained by the Council of Constantinople against the Pneumatomachi, and vindicated by the Fathers of Ephesus and Chalcedon against Nestorius and Eutyches according to that same symbol. For "faith is at every time one and unchangeable." "Thus confessing these things (which he had set forth at the beginning of his confession of the right faith) with the universal Church of God, we wish all Christians to know that, just as we have one God and Lord, so also we have one faith. There is one definition of faith, to confess and rightly glorify the Father, and Christ the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit. This confession we keep, into which also we have been baptized—granted indeed by our great God and Savior Jesus Christ to his holy disciples and Apostles, and by them preached throughout the whole world; and the three hundred and eighteen holy Fathers gathered at Nicaea against Arius—he with his impiety being condemned—handed on the same confession, that is, the symbol and the doctrine of the faith (τὴν αὐτὴν ὁμολογίαν ἢ σύμβολον καὶ μάθημα τῆς πίστεως), to the holy Church of God; and after them the holy Fathers at Constantinople... following in all things that same holy symbol handed down by the three hundred and eighteen holy Fathers. Moreover, those who met first at Ephesus and those who met at Chalcedon... following in all things the aforesaid holy symbol, condemned the heretics with their impiety."

I now ask: Is this one and the same confession of the right faith—this one definition of faith, this one symbol and doctrine of the faith, which is said to be contained in the preaching of Christ and the Apostles, in the Nicene symbol, in the Constantinopolitan explanation, in the Ephesian and Chalcedonian definitions against

the Nestorians and the Monophysites, and in Justinian's own very lengthy confession with whose identity with the same symbol the emperor is chiefly concerned—understood according to the sense of the right faith, or materially according to the words? I think that not even Macarius will deny that what is singly considered is the agreement of all these documents in regard to the very right faith and doctrine; and in this sense there is one definition of faith in all, as Justinian speaks. But if that is so, the "other definition of faith," or the "other symbol and doctrine of faith," which Justinian reports that the Fathers at Ephesus proscribed in opposition to that one definition of faith which he immediately before had declared, must necessarily be understood as a contrary definition or symbol—one by which the sense of the doctrine of Christ, the Apostles, the preceding councils, and the entire Church would be altered.

Therefore the reference to that Ephesian decree, which Justinian immediately subjoins to the foregoing and on which Macarius relies to persuade his fiction, is understood by Justinian in that genuine sense in which the decree itself was enacted at Ephesus against Nestorian errors "inserted into the symbol in falsified fashion" —that is, it concerns the non-insertion of contrary doctrines, and by no means in the Photian sense concerning sincere explanations of the right faith. Once the unity of the definition of faith has been set forth —in the doctrine of Christ, of the Apostles, of the four preceding synods, and of his own confession—Justinian continues thus: "And beyond these things, they anathematized those who hand on another definition of faith or symbol and doctrine to those approaching holy Baptism, or to those converted from any heresy, besides that which has been handed down, as has been said, by the three hundred and eighteen holy Fathers and explained by the one hundred and fifty holy Fathers."

The emperor, clearly, in context is considering the dogmatic part of the decree—namely, that it is never allowed to issue a profession that is "another" besides that one faith and definition in the whole doctrine revealed by Christ and proposed by the Church of God. As for the disciplinary part—that even a material change in the solemn and universal symbol cannot be made legitimately except by supreme authority over the whole Church—Justinian does not touch on it, except perhaps indirectly, in that he expressly speaks of the use of the more solemn symbol in the conferral of Baptism and the abjuration of heresy.

Let Macarius then hold and ponder carefully Justinian's words by which he concludes his confession: "If anyone, after such a right confession and the condemnation of the heretics, while the devout understanding remains intact, contends about names or syllables or expressions, and separates himself from the holy Church of God—as though piety for us resided not in realities but in names only and expressions—such a man, rejoicing as he does in dissensions, will render an account for himself and for those deceived and to be deceived by him, to our great God and Savior Jesus Christ on the day of judgment." (Mansi, vol. IX, pp. 538 sqq.)

4° Besides the Easterners, of whom we have spoken thus far, our illustrious interpreter also has Western doctors who, he says, declared the symbol to be absolutely immutable in its very single words.

First, in the letter of Pope Agatho to the emperors, which was read and accepted in the Sixth Council, he finds something said about preserving the words inviolate; and, no longer at all solicitous about the purpose of that papal letter, or about the sense of the words, or about the principles set forth there by which, just as all heresies are excluded, so too the Photian schism is most clearly condemned, he forthwith persuades his followers—who, he knows, will never read

the documents themselves—that Agatho condemned the insertion of the particle Filioque, which after all is itself a word. The passage he recites from that letter runs thus: "Those things which have been duly (κανονικῶς) defined by our holy and apostolic predecessors (Roman Pontiffs—whose definitions, as the Pontiff shortly demonstrates, are, by reason of Christ's promises, infallible and irreformable no less than those of ecumenical councils) and by the venerable five councils, we preserve, in the simplicity of heart and without ambiguity, for the faith handed down by the Fathers, always wishing and striving to have the one chief good: that nothing among those things that have been defined singularly be diminished, nothing be changed or added, but that the same things be guarded inviolate both in words and in senses

(126)." Thus does Macarius recite the passage, and over it he exults. But the Pontiff by these words is declaring the mandates he had given to his legates to the Sixth Ecumenical Council, the bearers of this letter. "To these bearers," he says, "we delivered also the testimonies of some holy Fathers whom this Apostolic Church of Christ (the Roman)

---

126 ἵνα μηδὲν παρὰ τὰ κανονικῶς ὡρισθέντα μειωθῇ, μηδὲν ἀλλαγῇ ἢ προστεθῇ, ἀλλὰ ταὐτὰ καὶ ῥήμασι καὶ νοήμασιν ἀπαράτρωτα φυλαχθῶσιν.

The Pontiff is mandating that the definitions of faith of the preceding popes (he undoubtedly has chiefly in view those of Leo I and Martin I in the Monophysite and Monothelite causes) and of the ecumenical councils remain un-wounded (this is what ἀπαράτρωτον signifies)—a wound which can be inflicted even by the addition or subtraction of a single word or syllable, as for example the Monothelites preached "one" personal operation and will of Christ; the Ecthesis of Heraclius and the Typos of Constans forbade saying either "one" or "two" wills; the Monophysites subtracted, in the Chalcedonian definition, the particle "that Christ is in two natures," substituting another: "out of two natures." Because of such corruption and wounding of defined faith, Agatho in this very letter sets forth an explicit profession and in it declares that there are to be believed two natures of Christ, "out of which and in which" (ἐξ ὧν καὶ ἐν αἷς), even after the union, he subsists, and two natural wills and operations.

Macarius, however—thinking nothing about definitions in general, of which the Pontiff speaks, but forcing everything upon the Constantinopolitan symbol alone and upon the particle Filioque, so as to throw dust in the eyes of the simple—thus translates the words cited: "that one should neither change, nor cut away, nor add anything to all that has been duly established; that, on the contrary, everything should be preserved inviolate in the very same terms and in the same sense" (p. 582). But the Pontiff neither says, nor could he without manifest contradiction decree, that "all things remain in the same words"; rather, he says that all dogmas defined by his predecessors or by the five councils should remain identical to themselves and not be corrupted either in words or in senses.

accepts, together with their books, to the end that... from these alone they may strive to give satisfaction whenever your imperial mildness shall command what this their spiritual mother (Constantine Pogonatus and his sons) and of God's propagated empire, the Apostolic Church of Christ, believes and preaches... Therefore we gave them leave or authority, before your most tranquil empire, whenever its clemency should order, to give straightforward satisfaction in so far only as it has been enjoined on them—to presume nothing at all to add, diminish, or change—but sincerely to set forth the tradition of this Apostolic See, as it has been determined by the apostolic predecessors of this See (127)." (Mansi, vol. XI, p. 235.)

The Pontiff is speaking in general of the faith handed on by the Apostles and, in particular, in so far as it is opposed to the errors of the Monothelites. Without making any distinction among the documents by which it has been preserved for us, he declares that the apostolic faith—as contained in the symbols, in the definitions of the councils, in the decrees of the Roman Pontiffs, and, generally, in the tradition of the Roman Church—must be kept inviolate both in words and in senses. These statements certainly do not exclude further declarations of the faith—the kind of which St. Agatho himself makes in this letter, and of which the Sixth Council (to which the Pontiff's letter was destined), and pontiffs and councils at any time, have given; they simply bar the corruption of the faith handed down, whether heresy be introduced covertly by means of certain words (as, notably, the Monophysites and Monothelites attempted), or be openly proposed by manifest statements. As for any distinction between

---

127 Ἀλλὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τούτου τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου, καθὼς ὡρίσθη ἀπὸ τῶν προηγησαμένων ἀποστολικῶν προέδρων, εἰλικρινῶς ἐξηγήσασθαι.

words and senses in the symbol and in other definitions, there is not only no mention of such a thing; it is excluded altogether both by the very nature of the case—since the subject is the corruption of the faith—and by the Pontiff's clear words.

5º Another witness from the Western Church to whom Macarius does not shrink from appealing, for the condemnation of the insertion of the particle Filioque, is Alcuin, whose words he quotes from a letter to the brethren of Lyons: "Guard yourselves with all vigilance against the new sects of the Spanish error; follow in faith the footsteps of the holy Fathers, and join yourselves to the universal Church with most holy unanimity. It is written: 'Do not transgress the landmarks of your fathers.' And do not insert new (128) things into the symbol of the Catholic faith, and in the ecclesiastical offices do not take a liking to traditions that were unheard of in ancient times." Alcuin, Ep. 90 (ed. Migne, vol. C, p. 288).

All these things Macarius refers to the condemnation of the particle Filioque when (he says) "in the West a controversy was stirred up about its addition, which had already been made to the symbol in the Spanish Church" (p. 582).

Thus Alcuin, according to Macarius, would have condemned the entire Church of Spain as a new sect—first, on account of the very doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, which would be contrary to the faith and the tradition of the holy Fathers; then, on account of the insertion of this error into the symbol, which would have been made by the new Spanish sects and thus in times quite recent for Alcuin. But these things are not only

---

128 The editors here add in parentheses the word "(names)," which, whether it be an addition or a necessary explanation, does not appear from the context; yet it fits very well with Alcuin's manner of speaking, who often reproaches the Adoptionists for the novel "names" introduced by them—"adoptive son" and "titular God."

false; they are so evidently absurd that they cannot be attributed to any man in his senses—and least of all to Alcuin.

For who in the year 798, when the letter was written, could have called the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son an error of new sects, when (as we have sufficiently demonstrated in the Treatise on the Trinity) it was the common faith of the whole Church and, notably, of the entire Western Church? Who could have said that the insertion in the symbol had been made by a new Spanish sect, when that addition had been decreed three centuries earlier in the Second Council of Toledo (A.D. 447) and, from the year 589 onward, by decree of the Third Council of Toledo, had been customary in the liturgy of the churches of Spain to be sung? And in the realm of the Franks—among the theologians familiar with Charlemagne—how could anyone else, and above all how could Alcuin, have given birth to such prodigies, when in Charlemagne's palace chapel and in other churches of his realms the symbol with that same inserted addition had already been adopted ([129]), and the principal endeavor of Alcuin and the others had been set upon asserting and elucidating this very doctrine of faith—so much so that, regarding with suspicion the Greek formula in which it is said that the procession is "from the Father through the Son," they defended as entirely necessary the profession that the Holy Spirit

[129] Henry Canisius opined (Veteres lectiones II, p. 397) that this usage had been discontinued in the realms of Charlemagne at the suggestion of Leo III, and therefore that what Alcuin writes in our letter to the Lyonnais —about not inserting new names into the symbol—should be referred to that suggestion of Leo. This is not only false but absurd. For that counsel was given by Leo to the legates of Charlemagne after the Synod of Aachen in 809 (see our Thesis XLI), whereas Alcuin wrote the letter to the Lyonnais in 798 and died in 804—six years before that conversation held by Leo with the legates in 810.

proceeds from the Father and the Son? This, indeed, we have shown in its place from the Libri Carolini, to which (written in 790, eight years before the letter to the Lyonnais) Alcuin is known to have contributed his efforts (cf. Hefele, Historia Conciliorum, vol. III, pp. 654 sqq.). Assuredly, Alcuin composed—and dedicated to Charlemagne—an entire book expressly to demonstrate the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son (Migne CI, pp. 64 sqq.), "in which, as indicated already in the title, the whole context is taken from the testimonies of Scripture and the Fathers, wherein it is clearly shown that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, and that certainly the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of the Father and of the Son." Likewise in his other works he everywhere teaches that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, in such wise that it is manifest that this profession was beyond controversy among Catholics generally and especially among the theologians of Charlemagne—indeed, that Alcuin in particular not only did not regard it as an error of new sects, but absolutely defended it as an article of the ancient Catholic faith. See Alcuin, Commentary on John, IV.17 (on Jn 7:23); VI.27 (on Jn 15:26); De fide Trinitatis, I.13–14; II.19–20; In Symbolum, III, at the end; Confessio fidei (ed. by Chifflet; and also by Mabillon, ascribed to Alcuin), P. I nn. 12, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 26; P. III nn. 1, 2, 6, 10, 22, 24.

As to what "new sects of the Spanish error" Alcuin told the Lyonnais to beware of with all vigilance, no one can doubt who has studied the history of that time and Alcuin's own writings. Frobenius Forster, editor of Alcuin's works, notes that "the first and chief task for which blessed Alcuin, summoned by Charlemagne from England to France, was engaged, was the refutation of the new sect of the Adoptionists, which, having arisen in Spain, had by that time begun to gain ground also in France." Against this sect he wrote his works—first one book, then seven against Felix of Urgell, and four others

against Elipandus of Toledo—along with several letters. In these writings about the new sect of the Adoptionists, about the "new names," about the "Spanish error," about a doctrine contrary "to the symbol of the universal Catholic Church," he speaks in almost the same words as those cited by Macarius from the letter to the Lyonnais. In the Letter to Laidradus, bishop of Lyons—whom Macarius also names in that letter to the Lyonnais that he cites—while sending four books against Elipandus, he expresses his concern for the faith of southern Gaul: "I judge it especially fitting to expend my powers for your most holy charity in this matter, lest the neighboring pestilence of the Spanish error be able to stain the minds of some among you" (Migne CI, p. 231). In the books against Elipandus he declares that, by the doctrine of the adoptive Son of God, something contrary is added to or taken away from the Church's symbol. "Whoever denies that the Only-begotten Son of God was crucified for the salvation of the world under Pontius Pilate, suffered and was buried, and rose on the third day, is altogether contrary to the symbol of the universal Catholic Church, in which it is most truly chanted (130) that all these things were accomplished in the Only-begotten Son of God" (Contra Elipandum, IV.4). "Undoubtedly one

130 From these points, (a) we learn that, as in Spain, so too in the realms of Charlemagne, before the year 800—when Alcuin wrote these things—it had already become customary to chant the symbol in which the particle Filioque is known to have been present; (b) likewise, from these appeals to the symbol against the Adoptionists, we understand what Walafrid Strabo recounts (De rebus ecclesiasticis 22; Migne CXIV, p. 947): "Among the Gauls and the Germans, after the deposition of Felix the heretic —who under the most glorious Charlemagne, ruler of the Franks, had been condemned" (that is, after the Council of Frankfurt in 794), "the same symbol began to be repeated more widely and more frequently in the offices of Mass."

spirit through you proclaims Christ as an adoptive son and a titular God, while another through the Apostles proclaims Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God, true God and the proper Son of God; to whose proclamation we give wholehearted assent, adding or subtracting nothing at all from the most holy doctrine or from the universal symbol or from ecclesiastical custom, but setting ourselves firmly within the boundaries of the paternal tradition and the truth of the Catholic faith" (ibid., IV.14). He warns Elipandus: "Do not allow any new names to be inserted into the paternal traditions... do not allow the new name of 'adoption' in Christ—which from the beginning of apostolic preaching has been unheard of in the world—to be sounded or read or preached to Christian ears" (Ep. ad Elipandum 1; Migne CI, p. 236). He complains that, "in the last times of the world, the Adoptionists invent certain new names—unheard of in ancient times—about the humanity of the Lord Christ, or about the divinity (which, namely, they called 'titular') of him who was born of the Virgin" (Contra Felicem, I.4; Contra Elipandum, I.16; IV.14). He calls them "a new sect, unheard of in ancient times" (Contra Felicem, I.7; II.10; Ep. ad Laidradum; Contra Elipandum, I.16; IV.5).

Now, what Alcuin adds in his letter—"and in the ecclesiastical offices do not take a liking to traditions that were unheard of in ancient times"—editor Frobenius Forster refers to the non-use of salt in the sacrifice of the Mass and to the triple immersion in Baptism, which are treated in the other part of the letter. To me, however, on account of the intimate connection with what precedes, these also seem to be said against the Adoptionists' arguments. For already in their letter to Charlemagne, no. 11—written before the Council of Frankfurt (Migne XCVI, p. 874)—and later in their letter to Alcuin, no. 8 (Migne CI, p. 1324), they had appealed, for their heresy, to the testimonies "of the holy Fathers venerably serving at

Toledo" as set forth "in the oracles of the Masses," that is, to testimonies of the Mozarabic liturgy. The Fathers at Frankfurt, when they were unwilling or unable to examine the very context of those testimonies, on the supposition of the sense which the Adoptionists were obtruding, refused to admit the authority of such prayers in their synodical letter to the bishops of Spain, no. 7 (Migne CI, p. 1333), in the year 794, because those prayers—in that sense, namely, in which they were understood—would be repugnant to the Roman liturgy (131). Alcuin, however, later—around the year 800 (Contra Elipandum II.7–9; Migne CI, p. 264)—partly asserted that "certain juniors, bound by the chains of this new unbelief to their own perdition, have corrupted the sayings of the holy doctors and have stained with their most evil stubbornness the name of their forefathers"; partly he showed that the texts adduced are to be interpreted not of Christ's but of our adoption; and however they may be understood, he opposed to them—just as the Fathers of Frankfurt had done—the liturgy of St. Gregory the Great.

Therefore these "traditions corrupted by the juniors" and "unheard of in ancient times" he warned, in 798, were not to be cherished in the ecclesiastical offices; and with all vigilance there was to be care that the new dogmas of the Spanish error not be inserted into the symbol—namely, by which error faith in "Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God," is perverted into the heresy of "Jesus Christ, the adoptive son of God." On every side, then, it is absurd to

131 "It is better to believe the testimony of God the Father about his Son than that of your Ildefonsus, who composed such prayers for you for the solemnities of Mass as the universal and holy Church of God does not have; nor do we think that you are heard in them. And if your Ildefonsus in his prayers named Christ 'adoptive,' our Gregory, Pontiff of the Roman See and most renowned doctor in the whole world, in his prayers never hesitated to call him 'Only-begotten.'" Fathers of Frankfurt, loc. cit.

transfer these statements to the profession concerning the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son, which Alcuin always retained and expressly defended as the ancient Catholic faith, set forth in the Scriptures and handed on by the Fathers.

CHAPTER II.

ON MACARIUS'S ARGUMENT FROM THE STATUTES OF THE PHOTIAN SYNOD

One more document remains in Macarius's citations—a striking proof of Greek perfidy. "A full council," he says, "was held at Constantinople under the Emperor Basil and the Patriarch Photius in the year 867, at which, besides a great number of bishops, all the 'ecumenical' (sic) patriarchs and the Roman Pontiff himself were present through their legates; and this council, representing the whole Church in the East, was for a long time counted as the eighth ecumenical. It expressly, and as though on purpose against the Latins, repeated the Ephesian prohibition and decreed the immutability of the Creed. And then, after citing the words of this so great council of the year 867—which is not without reason to be regarded as ecumenical—he repeats that the legates of Pope John VIII were present at the synod, who, after the example of all the others then

present, likewise gave the following vote: 'This is just: let no other rule of faith be composed any more.'" (132)

It is evident here once again that Macarius, with no regard for history and the documents, and trusting in the ignorance of his pupils, serves up to them whatever falsehoods he has found written in the polemical books of his sect (for example, Nilus of Rhodes—see Mansi XVII, p. 371). He did not think it worth the trouble, nor necessary for his readers, to inquire about the mode and form and about the credibility of the authors in that council which he claims represented the entire "ecumenical" Church; what the legates of the Pope had in their mandate, and what they did there; what judgment the Pope formed about the council itself and about his own legates;

---

132 "A whole council of pastors, which assembled at Constantinople in the time of the emperor Basil and the patriarch Photius (year 867), and which long passed in the East for the eighth 'œcumenical': it represented, in fact, the whole œcumenical Church; for besides a great number of bishops who were present in person, all the œcumenical patriarchs and the pope himself were present in the persons of their Vicars. Well then! there once more, in the face of the whole world, and as though expressly against the Latins, who already had admitted the Filioque, the œcumenical Church repeated with full precision the prohibition of the Council of Ephesus regarding the invariability of the symbol... At this Council, we repeat, there were also present the delegates of Pope John VIII; John himself speaks of them and designates them by name, and on that solemn occasion, after the example of all the other attendants, they gave their vote as follows: 'This is just; let no other rule of faith be composed any more.'" Macarius, loc. cit., pp. 584–585. — The words of the conventicle may be read in the Greek text in Mansi, T. XVII, p. 516. In his translation Macarius, as usual, alters them at his pleasure; but it is not worth the trouble to demonstrate these defects of the version, for Photius undoubtedly intended, as to the substance of the matter, what his most worthy disciple says.

how the legates of John VIII (who was created Pontiff on 14 December 872) could have been present at the council of 867. On these points I shall speak somewhat more expansively than the present place would require, so that, from the unheard-of frauds and corruptions of Photius and the Photian party—which constitute the very incunabula of the whole schism—there may be seen more clearly with what right the Photians raise tragedies about "Latin interpolations," to be examined by us in the following section.

1º Photius gathered three robber-assemblies, all of which were at times styled by his followers "ecumenical councils." He held the first in 861 and the second in 867 during his first invasion of the see of Constantinople; the third in 879–880 during his second usurpation. In the year 861, in order to appear to have the Apostolic See consenting, while the a-latere legates were present—Radoald, bishop of Portus, and Zachary, bishop of Anagni—whom St. Nicholas I had sent with the mandate only to examine the cause of Photius the usurper and of Patriarch Ignatius, and to report back to the Pope—he convoked 318 bishops; and in this his synod, after corrupting the legates and nefariously truncating and interpolating the letters of the Pope, he drove St. Ignatius—who had been subjected to many torments—out of the patriarchal see and confirmed his own intrusion. Nicholas, however, when these crimes had been discovered, declared Photius to be alien from every priestly honor and name and entirely stripped of every clerical office, and furthermore, unless he obeyed the Pontifical sentence, bound him, together with his communicants, with the chains of anathema; he rescinded all the acts of that robber-council in which Ignatius was thought to have been deposed; he condemned his own prevaricating legates with a sentence of deposition and excommunication. We have the whole history distinctly set forth in the letters written by St. Nicholas I in the case

of Photius, which the Pope himself collected together and sent to all Catholics (Mansi XV, p. 159 sqq., ep. 1–16).

After Photius, despite all frauds, could not obtain from Pope Nicholas confirmation of his episcopate, and saw himself and his accomplices condemned, he convoked—or at least fabricated in great part—in 867 another conventicle, in which our "excellent historian" Macarius asserts that the addition of the particle Filioque in the Creed was condemned. What things were carried out and concocted in this pseudo-synod of 867 we learn from what is reported in the Life of St. Nicholas I, in the Life of St. Ignatius authored by Nicetas Paphlago, in the Roman Council of 869 under Hadrian II (successor of Nicholas, who died 13 November 867), and most especially in the Eighth Council, truly ecumenical, which was celebrated that very year 869 (Mansi XV, 157; XVI, 123–129, 136–138, 155, 156, 163, 174, 184, 198, 255 sqq., 418). In that robber-council of 867 Photius, by forging very many subscriptions and by taking certain men from the street as though they were vicars of the Eastern patriarchates, dared to pronounce a sentence of excommunication and deposition against the

Roman Pontiff (133). The acts composed at Photius's pleasure were condemned both at Rome in the synod of Hadrian II and in the Eighth Ecumenical Council and were consigned to the flames. In that same Eighth Council, the sentences of Nicholas I against Photius and his sectators were adopted and St. Ignatius was restored; but on account of the crime perpetrated against the Roman Pontiff, a new sentence of condemnation and excommunication was added. "Since it appeared that Photius, after the most just sentence and condemnation had been pronounced against him by the most holy Pope Nicholas because of his most wicked invasion of the Church of the Constantinopolitans, had, along with his other evil deeds, even found certain reprobates and flatterers from the streets and alleys, and had named and set forth as vicars of the most holy three patriarchal sees of the East these men, and, gathering with them an 'assembly of malignants' and a 'council of vanity,' had stirred up calumnious accusations and crimes against the most blessed Pope Nicholas, and had often insolently and boldly promulgated anathema against him and against all who communicated with him—whose books we also have seen as

133 The legates of the Roman Pontiff did not take part in this robber-synod. Donatus, bishop of Ostia, Leo, presbyter, and Marinus, deacon of the Roman Church, had indeed been sent by St. Nicholas to execute the sentences against Photius the usurper; but when they had reached, by way of Bulgaria, the borders of the Byzantine Empire, there was proposed to them a profession of faith, together with all the calumnies against the Catholic Church as contained in Photius's encyclical shortly before sent to the Easterners, and a pledge of communion with Photius to be subscribed. Since they refused this profession and pledge—which the accused was presenting to the judges—they were compelled, with the business unfinished, to return to Rome, after they had waited in vain for forty days for a change in the counsels of the Emperor Michael "the Drunkard" (τοῦ μεθυστοῦ).

monuments, stitched together by that very wicked work and deceitful dictation, which were likewise synodically consumed by fire—: for this reason, for the safeguarding of ecclesiastical order, we anathematize first indeed the aforesaid Photius also on account of this kind of cause (134), and then every one who henceforth shall act fraudulently with craftiness, and shall adulterate the word of truth, and shall feign false vicars, or shall contrive books of mendacious dictation, etc." (canon 6 of the Eighth Council—Mansi XVI, p. 163. Compare can. 21—abridged Greek can. 13—and the "definition" (τὸν ὅρον) of the holy universal synod, ibid., p. 174, 184, 405).

2° In reality, however, the "council of shepherds representing the whole ecumenical Church," to which Macarius appeals, is none other than the third robber-assembly of 879–880, most similar—in Greek frauds and in the prevarication of the Pope's legates—to the first conventicle of 861.

---

134 In the Roman synod which is inserted into Action VII of the Eighth Council, Pope Hadrian II pronounced this sentence (cap. 2): "Photius—although he has been lawfully condemned and anathematized by my predecessor and by us for crimes previously perpetrated—now nevertheless, because by more recent excesses he has greatly surpassed his former iniquities, and, 'setting his mouth in heaven,' has burst forth with new rashness against the venerable privileges of the Apostolic See, when namely he did not fear to resist the supreme ordination disposed in the principate of the blessed Apostle Peter... by the censure of apostolic authority we condemn him anew, and for these things in particular we bind him with the shackles of anathema, rightly associating him with Dioscorus (who, in the robber-synod of Ephesus, dared to condemn Pope Leo), of whom he has appeared as an imitator in this matter; and in everything we agree with the holy great Synod of Chalcedon in punishing so pernicious a presumptuous man" (Mansi XVI, p. 129).

Photius, condemned by the Eighth Ecumenical Council and relegated by the Emperor Basil the Macedonian to a monastery, afterwards by evil deceit regained the emperor's favor (whatever be the precise manner of the deceit, which Nicetas recounts in the Life of Ignatius—see Mansi XVI, p. 283). Certainly, while Patriarch St. Ignatius was still alive, he was recalled from exile along with his sectators and stirred up many dissensions and tumults; when Ignatius had died (23 October 878 or 877), Photius was again thrust by the emperor into the patriarchal see. Immediately both the emperor and Photius sent legates and letters, replete with falsehoods, to John VIII, the successor of Hadrian II, seeking confirmation of Photius's "restitution." John sent his own legates—Paul, bishop of Ancona, and Eugene, bishop of Ostia—who, having been sent in the cause of Bulgaria to Ignatius, were already at Constantinople; to them he added Peter, presbyter of the Roman Church, equipped with six documents—namely, five letters to the emperors, to the clergy of Constantinople, to Photius, to the bishops and patricians devoted to the party of Ignatius, and to his own legates Paul of Ancona and Eugene of Ostia—to which there was added as a sixth the commonitorium or instruction for those three legates themselves. From these documents we learn not only what the Pope's sentence was, but we are also made certain about the shameless frauds perpetrated by Photius in his conventicle. For divine Providence preserved the very Latin original text of the Pope's letters; whence we see that the Greek version arranged by Photius and read in the conventicle was corrupted and often fabricated into an entirely

different—and even contrary—sense precisely in those parts which contain the very substance of the matter and the Pope's decision (135).

In the letters to the emperors and to Photius—which are by far the most important—the principal matters which the Pope establishes in the genuine original text are as follows.

a) He teaches with the utmost clarity the divine origin and authority of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. "You submit all things to the authority of the Roman See, to whose author—that is, to the prince of all the Apostles—when the Lord spoke, the precept was given: 'Feed my sheep.' That the Roman See is truly the head of all the Churches of God, the principal rules of the blessed Fathers and the statutes of orthodox emperors declare, and the most reverend letters of your piety attest" (Mansi XVII, p. 137). Photius in his paraphrase overturns all of this, so that concerning the Roman See he says only this: "You approached the holy Roman Church through your apocrisiaries and through your divine letters"; and he refers the rest not to the Roman See but to St. Peter alone, whom the Lord constituted the head of all the Churches (ibid., p. 396).

b) The Pope says that, moved by the prayers of the emperor and because of the needs of the times, he has now, after the death of Patriarch Ignatius, resolved to grant pardon to Photius, though an usurper, and by the supreme power granted to him in St. Peter, to absolve him, together with his sectators, from censures and to admit

---

135 Mansi at one time conjectured that John VIII had altered his letter to the emperors—found in his Regesta—into another letter, so that it might be that which Photius recited in the conventicle (Mansi XVII, p. 527). The very learned man himself afterwards retracted this (in the note to Natalis Alexander, Hist. Eccles., s. IX, diss. 4, § 27), and others confuted it (Hefele, Hist. Conc., IV, p. 438; Hergenröther, Hist. Photii, II, pp. 414–415). In truth, anyone will easily understand how absurd it would be, if he considers the schismatic character of the changes in the Photian paraphrase.

him to the see of Constantinople. "We therefore, duly admitting the prayers of your Serenity, because we know that Ignatius, of pious memory, the patriarch, has now migrated from the present life, and considering the circumstances of the time, decree that this pertains to pardon: namely, that what was done lately with respect to Photius himself—although he seized for himself, without consultation with our See, an office prohibited to him—shall stand" (namely, when the emperor thrust him, three days after Ignatius's death, into the patriarchal see). "And we, upon whom, according to the Apostle, there lies the solicitude for all the Churches of God, not wishing any controversy longer to remain in the Church of God, absolve this very patriarch, together with all whether bishops or presbyters or other clerics and with all laymen upon whom the sentence of judgment had been pronounced, from every bond of ecclesiastical sanction, and we judge that he be received to the holy Church of Constantinople and be the pastor of the Lord's flock—supported, that is, by that power which the Church, spread throughout the whole world, believes to have been granted to us by Christ our God in the very prince of the Apostles, the same Savior specially delegating the blessed Apostle Peter above the rest: 'I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven... and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven'" (ibid., pp. 137–138). Photius transfers all these things in his version to a wholly different sense. There the Pope is made to attest that he had long since sought a favorable time for restoring Photius to his own proper see, and he heaps shameless praises upon the usurper. "For we did not deem it right," it says there, "that such and so great a man should remain inert and idle; but that, being again placed in your sublime Church and shining there, he should accomplish those works toward priests and bishops which are customary to him and acceptable to God." Of Patriarch Ignatius's death, of pardon from censures, of absolution—there is no word at all.

Rather, the impostor dares to refer absolution to the Catholic bishops who at the Eighth Council had subscribed to Photius's condemnation. "You wrote to us," the Pope is made to say to the emperor, "that, opening the apostolic bosom full of humanity, we should receive into our care peace and concord for all in your Church, as many as either by subscribing with their own hand transgressed, or were in any other way liable to canonical penalties." What the Pope had said about Photius's usurpation of a prohibited office Photius interprets thus: "Although your (the emperor's) piety applied compulsion to the man first by restoring him before us—that is, before our legates had arrived there—yet we condone this, not from our own authority, although we have the power to do this, but taking our guidance from the apostolic constitutions and the decrees of the Fathers" (ibid., pp. 397, 401).

c) The Pope in his genuine letter excuses the reception of Photius by examples of the Donatists and Bonosians who, when they returned to the Church, were received in their orders when the preservation of ecclesiastical peace required it (ibid., p. 137). In his interpretation Photius makes the Pope argue very differently: "If those who had received ordination from the Donatists and from Bonosus were admitted, much more ought we not to despise, as though guilty and burdened with the yoke of penance, men conspicuous for orthodox faith (Photius with his party), renowned for severity of morals and exactness of life—almost indeed as much as to the point that they perform works of penance (that is, that they live a life nearly monastic)—but we ought to restore them to their former dignity" (ibid., p. 400).

d) In both letters—to the emperors and to Photius—the Pope, though he dispenses from the sentence pronounced by the Eighth Council against Photius, does so indeed from the fullness of power; yet he wholly receives that "venerable synod" as legitimate.

"For the sake of the peace of the Church of Constantinople we grant you pardon and communion also and rank... yet in such wise that henceforth a bishop shall by no means be ordained from the laity in that Church against the statutes of the holy Fathers, and that all that evil custom be utterly cut away from there, according to the chapter which on this matter was most fittingly promulgated in the venerable synod held at Constantinople in the time of our predecessor Hadrian the Younger" (ibid., p. 149). Photius not only perverts this passage—transferring what John had said about Hadrian II and about the approbation of the venerable synod (namely, the Eighth Council) to Hadrian I and to an altogether different matter—but he even dared to insert into the Pope's letters and into the Commonitorium for the legates a condemnation of the Eighth Ecumenical Council, of the Roman Synod under Hadrian II, and of the sentences of Nicholas against Photius, so that Pope John VIII—who, as archdeacon, had subscribed to Photius's condemnation (Mansi XVI, pp. 131, 447)—would have pronounced anathema against himself. "Receive the man without any excuse. Let no one allege those unjust synods (as many unskilled and ignorant think) which were held against him; let no one bring into the cause the decrees of our predecessors, the blessed Popes Nicholas and Hadrian (αἰτιάσθω); for those things which were done against the most holy Photius were not undertaken by them(!)" (ep. to the emperors, p. 401). "But this we ask, that your fraternity decree together with us that henceforth no one from the laity be suddenly raised to the supreme seat of the pontificate... and this we say according to the canon issued by a synod in the times of the most holy Pope Hadrian and Tarasius of blessed memory, patriarch of

Constan-tinople (136). We annul, condemn utterly, and reject the synod which was held there against your Reverence, both for other causes and because our predecessor, the blessed Pope Hadrian, did not subscribe to it" (ep. to Photius, ibid., p. 416). From these things which Photius thrust of his own accord into the letters of John VIII, his imposture is manifestly convicted, and so too are those things which he fabricated in the Commonitorium given by the Pope to his legates—even though the latter survives for us only in Photius's fraudulent interpretation. For the very same fabrications found in the interpolated letters are repeated there, and, if it be possible, even more shamelessly: "We will that it be promulgated in the presence of the synod that the synod which was held against the aforesaid Patriarch Photius under the most holy Pope Hadrian in the city of Rome (to which John himself had subscribed) and at Constantinople be from now on condemned (ἐξωστρακισμένη), void, and without force, and that it not be reckoned together with the other holy synod." After these Photius-fictions, read before the conventicle as though they were the mandates of Pope John, there follow the outcries of the whole robber-assembly, full of endless insults and anathemas against the Eighth Ecumenical Council and against all those who would not condemn it (ibid., p. 472).

e) In his genuine letters the Pope everywhere treats Photius as a man who up to that point was by no means a legitimate bishop, and he mercifully promises him pardon and absolution and the grant of the patriarchal see, on condition that Photius himself, in the presence of a council to be convened, "beg for mercy," "seek mercy, making satisfaction before the synod," "ask for mercy according to

136 What John had said about the "venerable synod," namely, the Eighth under Hadrian the Younger, Photius transfers to another synod under Hadrian I in the time of Tarasius; and he substitutes its condemnation for the approbation of the Eighth.

custom before the synod," and "use evident correction" (ibid., 137, 147, 149). By contrast, in Photius's version all these things are very different. There the Pope rejoices over Photius's restoration to the patriarchal see, from which he had been deprived and which was his proper one ([137]); there is no word about satisfaction and about begging for mercy; instead of this condition laid down by the Pope, something wholly different is substituted: "We ask your fraternity... not to disdain in the synod to proclaim God's mercy and help toward you, and the protection and labor of the most holy Roman Church, which it has borne for the sake of its tender affection and love toward you, persuading all to concord toward you and toward our approbation" (ibid., pp. 413, 416).

Now then, if this man dared so shamelessly to corrupt even the Pope's letters—while the legates were present, who did not understand the Greek language—and in the face of the conventicle, he forged whatever he pleased, much more easily did he concoct in the speeches and acts of the conventicle whatever he wished. Hence, just as it is certain and juridically proven that, in the case of his synod of 867, Photius fabricated its acts at will, so there remains a doubt, with respect to this other conventicle of 879–880, how much and what things are to be ascribed to the servile spirit and abject flattery of the Photian party, or to Photius's own corruptions and fabrications. This doubt arises both with regard to the first five sessions, and no less

[137] Ὅτι ἡ ἁγιωτάτη τοῦ Θεοῦ Κωνσταντινοπολιτῶν ἐκκλησία ἐν σοί συνεφώνησε καὶ συνῆλθέ σοι, καὶ ὅτι τὸν θρόνον, οὗ ἐστερήθης, ἀπέλαβες, ὃς ἦν ἴδιός σου· ὑπὲρ τούτων—λέγω δὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῆς ἀποκαταστάσεως, τῆς εἰς τὸν ἴδιον θρόνον κατέστης—Θεῷ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν ἐξ ὅλης ψυχῆς καὶ δυνάμεως ἀνεπέμψαμεν.

obtains with regard to the last two sessions ([138]), in which there is found a condemnation of the Catholic profession in the Creed and an assertion of Photius's primacy over the whole world "after the pattern of the supreme Pastor Christ"—in truly blasphemous words—and an approval of these sacrileges by the legates of the Roman Pontiff.

3° After, namely, the conventicle had been concluded in the fifth session by the subscriptions of all the bishops, two other sessions were superadded; the sixth is said to have been held in the palace under the presidency of the emperors, and with them sitting Photius "the most holy patriarch," the Roman legates, three vicars of the Eastern patriarchs, and eighteen metropo-litans. Emperor Basil, as presiding over this "ecumenical council," proposed that a certain "definition of ecclesiastical sentiment" be made by twenty-five priests. Then there was read—and, with the acclamations of those twenty-five

[138] Many learned men—although they admit that, as to the substance of the matters, the first five sessions were truly celebrated—judge nevertheless that these last two were altogether fabricated by Photius; among them is the Greek scholiast in Mansi XVII, p. 511 (see Hergenröther, Photius, II, p. 535).

men, approved, yet subscribed by no one (139)—a condemnation of any addition or diminution in the formula of the Council of Nicaea, "which the other holy and ecumenical synods confirmed and upon which they built."

In the very form of the condemnation a distinction must be made between what is expressly said and what Photius intended in his mind. Looked at in themselves, the words admit without doubt an orthodox sense, the same which we saw expressed in the proscription of Theodore of Mopsuestia's creed by the Fathers of Ephesus and in other Catholic documents—that only an illegitimate alteration of the Creed, or its sheer corruption by erroneous additions, is forbidden. Indeed, it could seem indicated clearly enough in that Photian

---

139 In this sixth session Emperor Basil, when asked to "confirm" (βεβαιώσαι) by his subscription all that had been done in the synod, subscribed "assenting in so far as it pertains to the confirming and establishing of the holy and ecumenical seventh synod, and to the confirming and holding valid the promotion of Photius... and to the abolition of all things which were written or spoken against him." In the same way the two imperial sons Leo (who later expelled Photius) and Alexander subscribed, and the third son Stephen, subdeacon (who thereafter was substituted by his brother Leo for Photius in the patriarchal see). Of the Creed there is no mention at all in these very imperial confirmations. Photius later asserted indeed in the Mystagogy n. 89 and in the letter to the Archbishop of Aquileia n. 25 (Migne CII, p. 819) that the legates of John VIII subscribed to the Creed without the particle Filioque. But since, according to the Acts, the legates and the other bishops put an end to the conventicle by their subscription in session V, while in session VI it appears that only the emperors subscribed, it seems that Photius extended the value of the earlier subscription also to these superadded sessions VI and VII—in which alone there was discourse about dogma, and therefore they are said to contain a "definition of ecclesiastical sentiment" (ὅρος τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ φρονήματος). See Mansi, loc. cit., pp. 513, 520.

"definition" that, just as a canonical addition was made to the Nicene formula in the Second Council, so additions made by legitimate authority are always lawful, whenever a new heresy renders necessary an explicit profession of some article of the Catholic faith. For the Photian decree has it thus: "Already of old we embrace in mind and tongue, and we proclaim with a clear voice to all, the most sincere definition of the Christian faith handed down by the Fathers and reaching down to us, subtracting nothing, adding nothing, changing nothing, adulterating nothing. For subtraction and addition—when no heresy has been stirred up by the devices of the Evil One—bring condemnation upon things that are by no means to be condemned, and an inexcusable insult to the Fathers; but to change the definitions of the Fathers with adulterine words is far more grievous than that former guilt" (Mansi, loc. cit., p. 516) ([140]). These words in their obvious sense say that alterations of a symbol established by the Fathers—even those which of themselves contain nothing amiss—are rash and imply a condemnation of a formula already established as though insufficient, and an affront to the Fathers as though less understanding, when such changes are made without grave reason and without the necessity of opposing new heresies; whereas changes that induce an adulterated meaning, as is plain, can never be made without grave wickedness. Whence it follows that additions of the former kind can be made lawfully and without any injury to the ancient formula or its authors by legitimate authority, whenever a new heresy—stirred up by the devices of the Evil One—makes necessary or opportune an addition and explicit profession of some article. This

[140] Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀφαίρεσις καὶ ἡ πρόσθεσις, μηδεμιᾶς ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦ πονηροῦ τεχνασμάτων κινουμένης αἱρέσεως, κατάγνωσιν εἰσάγει τῶν ἀκαταγνώστων καὶ ὕβριν τῶν Πατέρων ἀναπολόγητον· τὸ δὲ κιβδήλοις ἀμείβειν ῥήμασιν ὅρους Πατέρων, πολὺ τοῦ προτέρου χαλεπώτερον. — The Latin version in Mansi at this place bears no manifestly false sense.

assuredly is altogether Catholic doctrine, to which the Roman legates and all Catholics could consent, and by which in advance the addition of the particle Filioque is vindicated—a thing not yet then effected in the Roman Church, but whose necessity was subsequently induced by the Photian heresy itself "stirred up by the devices of the Evil One" (141).

4° These things are indeed true if the words be considered in themselves; but without doubt the heresiarch had another aim. For here there holds also what the Fathers often complain of concerning the Arians: that in their insidious formulas they said one thing in words and understood another in their mind. After he had been condemned by St. Nicholas I on account of his invasion of the see of Constantinople, that most arrogant man, as though driven by furies, in 867 wrote an encyclical letter to the Eastern patriarchs by which he proposed to them that a synod be held against Nicholas. In this letter he dared, for the first time, to accuse the Western Church of five heresies (142), none of which had even occurred to him as long as he hoped he could extort by fraud and lies an approbation of his invasion from Nicholas. He reproaches, in fierce but brief words, four

---

141 Confer scholiastam Graecum apud Mansi XVII, p. 512.

142 In the letter to King Michael of Bulgaria, written at the same time, Photius adds to these five four other charges—partly invented, partly ridiculous—by which he thought that a rude people could be moved and turned away from the Roman Church. Among the Latins, he said, chrism is compounded from river water; at Easter, after the manner of the Jews, a lamb is blessed upon the altar together with the Lord's body and is offered; deacons, without having received the presbyterate, are ordained bishops; finally, that enormous "heresy" is added, which henceforth was often adduced into accusation by the Greeks, because clerics do not refuse to shave their beards. See Nicholas I, ep. 70 (Mansi XV, p. 555); Hergenröther, Hist. Photii, III, pp. 820 sqq.

points: the fast of Saturday; the use of dairy products in the first week of Lent (that is, after Quinquagesima Sunday); the law of clerical celibacy; the rejection in Bulgaria (which pertains to the Western patriarchate) of chrismation administered by presbyters (Photians, and with chrism consecrated by Photius). But in describing, on false suppositions and in sophistic subtleties, and in refuting, and in devoting to every curse, the fifth heresy, he keeps no bounds at all. "They have," he says, "by extreme audacity undertaken to adulterate the most holy Symbol with spurious statements and adventitious words, devising a novel dogma—that the Holy Spirit proceeds not from the Father alone, but also from the Son." By this doctrine, he says, "a double cause of the Holy Spirit is established; the unity of God is dissolved into a duality; the theology of Christians is torn no less than in the mythology of the pagans; through the fable of these men the crime of Macedonius against the Holy Spirit is introduced; the word is blasphemous; it is the pinnacle of blasphemy against all the holy prophets, apostles, priests, martyrs, and against the very words of the Lord, declaring war on God; by this God-hating opinion there are introduced not three, but four—or rather infinitely many—hypostases; the asserters of this doctrine are leaders not only of the impious but also of madmen; the doctrine is shown impious, insane, atheistic by a thousand arguments which are reserved for a fuller exposition at the Council; if other things were lacking, this blasphemy reaching its summit against the Spirit—or rather against the whole Trinity—would by itself suffice to subject them to a thousand anathemas" (Migne CII, ep. 13, n. 4–33). Without doubt in the acts of the "ecumenical council"—that is, the robber-synod of 867—Photius must be supposed to have repeated these curses.

Now this same Photius, after his second usurpation of the see in 879, solicitously seeks the communion and approbation of those Westerners whom a little before he had condemned as heretics—and

by this very fact he recognizes them as entirely orthodox, persisting in all their prior doctrine, without any further mention of "heresy." The man had talent enough to perceive for himself the manifest contradiction in his whole mode of acting, in which he showed himself to be concerned not with the orthodox faith but solely with the fulfillment of his ambition. Hence, so that at least in these appended sessions VI and VII of the conventicle of 879–880 he might prepare some refuge for himself, he inserted a condemnation of "addition to the Creed" in ambiguous words (143) which could be taken in a Catholic sense, while he himself would substitute another meaning to assert his own heresy and to condemn the Catholic doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son.

Note: To the same end of reconciling the contradictions in Photius's deeds there was later fabricated, by him or by some follower of his, that letter of John VIII of which we made mention above, as though the Pope, after abjuring his own doctrine and that of his predecessors about the procession of the Holy Spirit, had finally embraced the Photian heresy. — In the Liber Diurnus Romanorum

---

143 John Beccus already showed this mind of Photius. When Photius perceived that he would incur the censure of all, because he had called the whole Roman Church—so long as Pope Nicholas did not admit him—"an injury against God, impious, and to the very end prevaricating," whereas when Pope John consented to his exaltation to the patriarchal throne he proclaimed that same Church holy and a teacher of piety, he therefore, as though in apology for the peace made with Pope John, put forward that the latter had accepted the symbol of faith through his vicars, and that "with mind and tongue and sacred hands those illustrious and admirable men had subscribed to it and sealed it." Graec. orthod. II, pp. 139–140. The last words are taken by Beccus from Photius's Mystagogy n. 89.

Pontificum there are contained three formulas of the profession of faith which the Popes used to issue at their consecration. In both the second and the third formula—of which the former had been introduced about sixty years, and the latter almost a whole century, before the pontificate of John VIII—the Popes explicitly professed the article on the procession of the Holy Spirit, as St. Gregory the Great had done long before in his own consecration (see above, p. 106). In the third (issued between the year 681 and 685) there is: "Credimus in unum Deum... Spiritum vero Sanctum nec genitum nec ingenitum, sed de Patre Filioque procedentem." In the second formula (probably issued in 714), after mention of the Councils of Nicaea and Constantinople I, the Popes declared: "Per haec duo sacra Concilia sanctam et inseparabilem Trinitatem, unum Deum unamque Trinitatis substantiam esse cognoscimus... dum de Patre Filius aeternaliter nascitur, Spiritus Sanctus de Patre procedere confirmatur eumdem Dei Filius de suo accipere perhibet, et in nomine suo mitti a Patre Spiritum Sanctum manifestat, et insuffiando discipulis, accipite Spiritum Sanctum, utpote de se procedentem adnuntiat" (cf. supra pp. 63 sqq.). The whole profession concludes with these words: "Unde et districti anathematis interdictioni subiicimus, si quis umquam, seu nos, sive est alius, qui novum aliquid praesumat contra huiusmodi evangelicam traditionem et orthodoxae fidei christianaeque religionis integritatem, vel quidquam contrarium immutare, sive subtrahere de integritate fidei nostrae tentaverit, vel ausu sacrilego, hoc praesumentibus consentire... Praesentem nostrae professionis paginam per N. notarium scriptam, cum nostrae manus subscriptione, coram omnibus relectam in confessione beati Petri Apostolorum principis deposuimus," etc. (Migne CV, pp. 47–57).

Moreover, the things which are reported to have been transacted on 3 March 880 in that gathering of twenty-five prevaricators—which they called the sixth session of the Council—

are presented as having been read again on 13 March in the church of Hagia Sophia before another assembly of bishops (whose number is not specified). This is called the seventh session of the Council, in which, with the approvals of all that had been done in session VI, and with silly flatteries toward Photius, and finally with a proclamation of the primacy of Constantinople over the whole world, the entire farce was completed (Mansi XVII, p. 511 sqq.).

We are not unaware how slavish a flock the Byzantine populace can be; nevertheless scarcely anyone will persuade himself that, in an assembly which had the appearance of a council, the mitred Photians could progress to such blasphemous adulation as is displayed in this seventh session; nor is it in any way credible that the Roman legates—suppose them as inept as you like—said and approved the things reported there. Why "Italy and Gaul" are expressly introduced to celebrate Photius's wisdom and sanctity finds its explanation not only in the desire to commend the Byzantine "primacy over the whole world," but perhaps also from this, that both in Italy by Popes Nicholas I and Hadrian II, and—at Nicholas's instigation—in the synods of Gaul and Germany and even in books published (Ratramnus, Aeneas of Paris), Photius's "sanctity" had been condemned and his "wisdom" refuted. Whether I have spoken truly in denying that the Pope's legates could have uttered and done the things feigned there, let the reader judge from the very apotheosis of "the divine Photius," which runs thus. "The most holy legates of ancient Rome said: 'Blessed be God that the excellent fame of the most holy Patriarch Photius has reached not only our region (in which up to now nothing other than an anathema against him had been heard), but also the whole world—and has its foundation not so much in words as, from his deeds (such as the double usurpation of the see; the fierce persecution against St. Ignatius; the interpolation of the letters of Nicholas and of synodal acts; the corruption of that

same Pope's legates; the celebration of robber-synods and the sentence of condemnation and deposition against the Pope himself; and finally the stubborn rebellion against the Eighth Council), it has penetrated to the ends of the earth. And it has passed not only into Gaul and Italy, but even into all the earth which is under the sun; and this is attested not only by those who profess the Greek tongue but even by the very barbarous and most savage race: that there is none like him in wisdom and knowledge, nor in bounty and compassion, nor in kindness and humility (sic), and that his deeds have always been more than can be told in words.'" Now follows what this fable teaches. "Procopius, archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, said: 'It was fitting in very truth that he be such a one, who has obtained the primacy of the whole world (τὸν τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου τὴν ἐπιστασίαν λαχόντα), after the pattern of our great high priest Christ our God. This moreover the blessed Paul, anticipating, also described, saying: "We have therefore a great high priest who has passed through the heavens"'" (namely, Paul wrote this prophetically about Photius, προλαβών). "For my speech will dare to advance even to that point" (the Westerners said that Photius had filled the ends of the earth with his glory; this does not suffice the Easterner, but he proves outright that his hero has penetrated the heavens from Paul's words), "since Scripture knows how to call 'gods' those who live according to grace." To this "primacy of the world" and to this "glorious ascent into heaven," what do you suppose the Pope's legates answered? "They replied: 'True is what you have said; we too who dwell in the furthest ends of the earth (τὰ ἔσχατα τῆς γῆς κατοικοῦντες), have heard these things. No man is like Photius in sanctity and wisdom; he holds the primacy of the whole world; the words which Procopius spoke about the great priest—Christ—were spoken prophetically about Photius.'" But the equality with Christ was not yet sufficiently expressed. "The Caesarean said: 'Knowing this, our exalted and great emperors have

ardent faith and love for our Pontiff (διάπυρον πίστιν καὶ πόθον εἰς τὸν ἀρχιερέα ἡμῶν); nor they alone, but every bishop and priest, and the monks, and those placed in the lay order—we are his followers and disciples; of his fullness we all have received, as the most glorious Apostles from our Lord Jesus Christ.'" To these blasphemies the legates respond: "If anyone does not have him as 'a holy patriarch' (πατριάρχην ἅγιον) and does not embrace his communion, let his portion be with Judas, and let him by no means be counted among Christians." "The holy synod exclaimed: 'We all feel and proclaim the same!'"

5° Just as Nicholas had condemned with anathema the robber-council of 861 and his prevaricating legates Zachary and Radoald (Rodoald), and just as Hadrian II had condemned the other conventicle of 867, so also John VIII pronounced the same sentence against this third "Council of the malignant," and against his own legates—about whom, however, it is difficult to say how much is to be attributed to their fault, or to ignorance of the language and of Greek manners, and how much to the interpolation and fabrication of documents perpetrated by Photius—though it seems certain that all three concurred together.

Pope John VIII, partly perceiving and partly suspecting that his mandates had not been obeyed, immediately after the return of the legates, in letters (250 and 251—Mansi XVII, pp. 185, 187) dated 13 August 880, admitted only the merciful "restoration" of Photius in the See of Constantinople; but he declared expressly that, if anything had been done in the synod against his apostolic precept, it would be of no force. "The things which, for the cause of the restoration of the most reverend Patriarch Photius, were mercifully transacted by synodal decree at Constantinople, we have received; and if perhaps our legates acted in that same synod against the apostolic precept,

neither do we receive [those acts], nor do we judge them to have any firmness."

Now, since in that synod absolutely everything was done against the apostolic precept, the consequence was that, as soon as the truth of the events came to light for the Pope, the entire conventicle should be explicitly condemned—a thing which already in the cited words of both letters had been implicitly declared to "have no firmness." In fact, he sent Marinus—who had presided at the Eighth Council—to Constantinople for an inquest into the matter; but when that man of fearless and incorrupt heart had been detained for thirty days in chains by the Emperor Basil, Photius's supporter, and at length, when released, had returned to Rome (which facts we know from the letter of Stephen VI to Emperor Basil—Mansi XVI, pp. 423, 475), John VIII—now fully informed of all the frauds—took the Gospel, ascended the ambo, and said in the hearing of all: "Whoever judges Photius not to have been condemned by the just judgment of God—just as those who went before me, the most holy Popes Nicholas and Hadrian, left him condemned—let him be anathema." The legates also—Eugene and Paul, bishops, and Peter the presbyter—who had performed their office so unworthily, having returned to Rome, were publicly condemned and deposed by Pope John upon the ambo (Mansi XVI, pp. 450–451). Concerning this sentence of John VIII, consonant with the decrees of Nicholas I and Hadrian II, there is further certainty from the letter of John IX to Stylianus (around the year 900—cf. Hergenröther, Photius, II, p. 707), in which this John IX confirms against Photius the judgment "of Nicholas, of John (namely, VIII), and of Stephen VI, and of the whole Roman Church" (Mansi XVI, p. 458; XVIII, p. 201). The same sentence of condemnation was pronounced by the Popes between John VIII (d. 882) and John IX (elected 898): Marinus (who had presided at the Eighth Council and had been sent by John VIII against Photius and

his conventicle to Constantinople), Hadrian III, Stephen VI, Formosus (Mansi XVI, pp. 423, 435, 439, 451, 458) (144).

From these condemnations of the Roman Pontiffs, just as in the Western so also in the Eastern Church there was no doubt about Photius's illegitimate episcopate and about the wickedness of his conventicles—and by name of that pseudo-synod of 879–880—at least from his second expulsion in the year 886 by Leo VI (the Wise or the Philosopher, son and successor of Basil the Macedonian) down to the times in which the schism initiated by Photius received consolidation and was welded into the Photian "synagogue." Under the patriarchs who obtained the see after Photius—Stephen (brother of Leo VI), St. Antony Cauleas, Nicholas Mysticus (d. 925), Euthymius—there was complete agreement with the Roman Pontiffs in condemning Photius the usurper and his conventicles, and expressly that pseudo-synod of 879–880, as is manifest from the negotiations held during this period between the emperors and the patriarchs with the Apostolic See to obtain dispensations for bishops and clerics ordained by the usurper. Not before 995 or 996—under Patriarch Nicholas Chrysoberges or his successor Sisinnius—when there was an ever stronger tendency toward schism, did Photius begin again, together with St. Ignatius, to be counted by the Byzantines, in manifest contradiction, among legitimate patriarchs. At this time there seems to have arisen (Hergenröther, III, pp. 725–726) that absurd pronouncement which, after the schism's completion under Cerularius in 1054, was often repeated by the Photian party, and which—as Mark of Ephesus said (Council of Florence, sess. VI)—is customary to be celebrated in the Church of Constantinople up to

144 Those who followed, after the death of Formosus in 896 until John IX in 898—Boniface VI, Stephen VII, Romanus, Theodore II—during their very brief pontificates, did nothing in the Eastern cause so far as is known to us.

this very day: "Let all things spoken or written against the most holy patriarchs Ignatius and Photius be anathema".

Since these things are so, Macarius and his fellow-schismatics can indeed appeal to that robber-synod of 880 in order to prove that Photius still harbored in his mind his own heresy concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit—which in 867 he had proclaimed in his encyclical letter—and that, since he no longer dared to set it forth openly, he concealed it, in ambiguous words, in that decree of his twenty-five sycophants. But they certainly cannot oppose to Catholics a conventicle in its entire form and in all its acts nefarious and proscribed so many times, since John VIII, by the anathema of the Roman Pontiffs, unless by the same right by which the Dioscorians obtrude their "Second Council of Ephesus" (145).

Note: By this pronouncement there are subjected to anathema: (a) all words and deeds in the conventicle of 861, in which, with many crimes alleged, Ignatius was condemned as a patriarch never legitimate—or at least as one who had been justly deposed in the particular conventicle of Photius in 858. But if he is anathema who says that Ignatius was illegitimate or justly deposed as patriarch, then by that very fact Photius is declared an usurper of the see and a tyrannical persecutor of St. Ignatius; and therefore everything decreed and done against Photius the usurper and persecutor in the letters of Nicholas I, in the Roman Council under Hadrian II, and in the Eighth Ecumenical Synod is proved most just. (b) By the same

145 Macarius (Introduction, etc., p. 585) dares to demand that Catholics recognize some authority in that conventicle of 880—which he (as we have seen) confounds with the other robber-synod of 867. After he has inculcated once and again that the legates of Pope John VIII were present at the council, he then concludes, in the subjoined note: "les écrivains romains ne s'expriment donc pas d'une manière très exacte, quand ils disent, que nous n'avons à leur opposer ici que le décret du Concile d'Éphèse."

pronouncement—and with a single gulp—anathema is pronounced at once upon all the letters of Nicholas against Photius, upon the Council of Hadrian and the Eighth Ecumenical; and by this very thing—as in the conventicle of 879—Photius is declared a legitimate patriarch from his first entry in 857, while Ignatius is declared the illegitimate usurper of the see either from his beginning in 846 or at least from his restoration in 869. Whence (c) this splendid "watch-word of peace," which Mark of Ephesus says is celebrated up to this day in the Church of Constantinople—no one can utter it without declaring war: war upon Photius by the approbation of Ignatius; war upon Ignatius by the approbation of Photius; and he pronounces anathema upon himself, seeing that he condemns not only one or the other but both—both Ignatius and Photius—by condemning "all things uttered and written against the two most holy patriarchs," while by the same act he approves as most just the decrees against two illegitimate usurpers. Truly they call good evil and evil good—and the same thing both good and evil at once. This is what an anonymous Greek most rightly warned in a note on that pseudo-synod convened by Photius in the presence of John VIII's legates: "Nor indeed has place what Mark of Ephesus says that it was customary to read in the Church of Constantinople: 'Let all things written and uttered against the holy patriarchs Ignatius and Photius be anathema.' For if Ignatius is proclaimed legitimate and holy patriarch—on account of which indeed all things done against him have been justly condemned and rejected—by all means the decrees against Photius must remain firm and ratified, since Photius did everything for the calumniation and condemnation of Ignatius and of his election" (Mansi XVI, p. 477).

SECTION IV.

ON THE ACCUSATIONS OF MACARIUS AGAINST CATHOLIC THEOLOGIANS

What still remains is to speak about the Photian arguments that Macarius, in his Theologia orthodoxa (pp. 415ff.), brings against Catholic theologians—arguments rather reheated from ancient cabbage—and about the charge of falsification and interpolation of documents, which, after Adam Zoernikaw and Theophan Prokopowicz, a man (as we now know) of such "candid" good faith levels against the Latins. Since the sophistry is of itself so manifest that I do not think it could deceive even Hyperborean ignorance, and since, moreover, concerning both heads we have already said much—both in the Treatise on the Most Holy Trinity and in this appendix—enough to exhibit a specimen of Photian imposture, we shall here dispatch both points very briefly.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE THEOLOGICAL ARGUMENTS OF MACARIUS AGAINST CATHOLIC THEOLOGY

1º There are three theological truths, none of which can be denied without the perversion of the whole mystery of the Most Holy Trinity. a) God—one and most simple, that is, one divine essence not capable of multiplication—has both the formal aspect of the absolute and of the relative (Lateran Council IV). Now the real relations in God are none other than relations of origin, that is, of a principle and of one proceeding from a principle (as we have often seen explained by Gregory of Nyssa and other Fathers). b) By these relations of origin alone—inasmuch as one proceeds from another and thus one is referred to another—the divine persons are related to one another; and by these relations they are really distinguished from one another. In all the other formal aspects of perfection, power, operation, under which we, with foundation in the reality, conceive one most simple essence, the persons are not distinguished among themselves but are absolutely one (Gregory Nazianzen, Augustine, and the Fathers universally). c) By reason of origin there is an internal necessary order of the divine persons such that the first person is from herself and without a principle of herself; the second person proceeds by generation from the principle through communication of the essence and therefore of all the perfections and formal aspects that are in the first, with the sole exception of the relation according to which, as principle and as one proceeding from the principle, they are referred to each other and by this are really distinguished among themselves; finally, the third person, proceeding from the principle that precedes only by priority of origin, likewise proceeds by communication of the essence and of all perfections, with the exception of the formal aspect of being a principle—or, what comes to the same thing, with the exception of the relative power productive of another person (Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and others).

In these three revealed truths it is implicitly contained that the second person alone proceeds from the first alone (μόνος ἐκ

μόνου), whereas the third proceeds from the first and the second as from one principle (ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου διὰ τοῦ προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου), inasmuch as those two—distinguished from each other by generation alone—are one with each other by the power and formal aspect of spiration, and by one spiration are referred as principle to the third person; and by this relation of spirator and spirated the third person is really distinguished from the first and the second. Moreover, since the first person alone is unbegotten, and the second person is generated from her by communication of all perfections and likewise of the spirative power, the first person remains the primordial principle of the Most Holy Trinity (ἡ πρώτη αἰτία, προκαταρκτική αἰτία, τὸ αἴτιον), in which is contained what the Fathers call μοναρχία.

There is no need here to repeat the demonstration of the three foregoing truths, which we have long since completed; but it is both clear in itself and repeatedly confirmed by us that in these truths there is implicitly contained—and therefore deduced with utmost certitude—the very truth now under discussion. This demonstration of one truth's being contained in another is what is called a theological reason. Macarius (p. 418) indeed notes, from Heinrich Klee, certain theological reasons for the Catholic truth, to all of which he finds no other reply than that notorious falsehood, namely, that the ancient Church taught the procession of the Spirit from the Father alone, and that the Son is distinguished from the Spirit not as a principle from one proceeding, but merely in that the Son is begotten by the Father, whereas the Spirit proceeds from the same Father alone. Now Macarius has indeed written this "procession from the Father alone" as the heading of each paragraph in his farrago of testimonies; but we already know how much truth there is in it. In all of them—unless perhaps one or another document be excepted that is heretical on other grounds and condemned with anathema—there is no trace of that Photian negation; in most, if they are looked at in

their very source and context, there is found a clear profession of the Catholic doctrine. Moreover, to assail our deduction of the truth from revealed principles, it would be necessary either to prove false one of the three truths set forth above, or to show the consequence to be illegitimate. But the former cannot be done, since we have shown in their proper places, by the explicit profession of the ancient Church, that those three truths pertain to the very internal economy of the Most Holy Trinity; and the consequence is evident to anyone who still uses the light of reason.

2º Let us now examine the theological arguments of Macarius for his heresy, which he lists as five.

a) "Spiration in the Father," he says, "is not an attribute of the essence, otherwise it would be common also to the Holy Spirit; therefore it is a personal property. But the personal property of the Father cannot belong to anyone except the Father alone, because the person of the Father is distinguished from the Son and the Holy Spirit. Therefore spiration belongs properly to the Father alone."

I distinguish the major: if by "personal property" is understood an internal relation which, precisely as a real relation, is not common to all three persons, then spiration is a personal property and not an absolute attribute of the essence; I grant the major. If "personal property" is taken in the strict sense as the relation that constitutes the person and is therefore proper to one person alone, I deny the major. In like manner I distinguish the minor as to its first part: the property of the Father that constitutes the person in the formal aspect of "Father" cannot belong to any except the Father alone; I grant the minor. But the relation of the Father by which he is not referred to the Son, and by which therefore he is not distinguished from the Son, cannot belong to any except the Father alone—I deny the minor. Then I distinguish the second part: the person of the Father is distinguished from the Son by generation, and

in no way by spiration; I grant the minor. "He is distinguished from the Son by spiration"—I deny the minor.

If the adversary says that spiration is a constitutive property, he introduces four persons; if he concedes that by it the Father is not constituted a person, nevertheless he asserts that spiration is proper to the Father alone, and in doing so he assumes as the principle of his demonstration the very thing he intends to demonstrate from it. For these two are entirely synonymous—"that spiration is proper to the Father alone," which he assumes as his principle, and "that the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone," which he feigns as the consequent from that principle—since both signify precisely the same thing, and both are equally denied by us as repugnant to Scripture and to tradition.

b) "In the Most Holy Trinity," he says, "according to Christian doctrine there is but one principle (μοναρχία); Catholics say that the principle is the person of the Father and the person of the Son. But the Father and the Son are two really distinct persons. Therefore, contrary to Christian doctrine, they admit two really distinct principles. If, however, they say that the Father and the Son are one principle, then that by which the divine persons are one is the divine essence; but the essence is common not to two only but to all three persons; whence not only the Father and the Son, but the Holy Spirit himself would be the principle of himself."

I distinguish the major as to its first part: in the Most Holy Trinity there is one principle, namely, one first unbegotten person, the principle without a principle, from whom every perfection (with the sole exception of the mutual relations by which the persons are distinguished among themselves) is communicated, so that from the Father the Son has ad intra to be one with the Father as the principle of the Holy Spirit, and from the Father through the Son the Holy Spirit has ad extra to be one principle with them both (τὸ ἄναρχον, καὶ

ἡ ἀρχὴ, καὶ τὸ μετὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς); I grant the major. "The Father is one principle in such wise that the unity of the Father with the Son is taken away in all respects where there is no opposition of relation"—I deny the major. As to the second part of the major: Catholics say that the person of the Father and the person of the Son are the principle of the Holy Spirit by one spiration, by which they are not referred to one another but to the third person who proceeds; I grant the major. "They say that the person of the Father and of the Son are the principle of the Holy Spirit by diverse relations, by which, being referred to one another, they are really distinguished among themselves"—I deny the major. I distinguish the minor in the same way:

The Father and the Son are two persons distinguished by active and passive generation, by which the Son proceeds from the Father; I grant the minor. "They are distinguished by spiration, by which they are not referred to one another but to the Spirit who proceeds"—I deny the minor. Therefore the two persons, really distinguished by generation, are one by spiration, and thus are one principle of spiration, one spirator—just as the three persons, though distinct, are one principle of creation, one creator.

As to that most "wise" observation so often repeated already by Photius and now again by this Photius-like writer about the Holy Spirit as if he were the principle of himself, the reply is: the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one by the divine essence under every formal aspect that is not the relation of origin of one person from another; therefore the Father and the Son are one with each other under the formal aspect of spiration, because the Son does not proceed by spiration and is therefore not distinguished from the Father by spiration; but the Father and the Son are distinguished by spiration from the Holy Spirit as the principle from the one proceeding from the principle.

Note: "Let him understand that, just as the Father has in himself that the Holy Spirit proceed from him, so he has given to the Son that the same Holy Spirit proceed from him, and both without time; and thus, when it is said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, let it be understood that he also proceeds from the Son, because the Son is 'from the Father.' For if the Son has whatever he has from the Father, he has from the Father assuredly that the Holy Spirit also proceed from him... The Father alone is not from another... but the Son is born of the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father principally, and—he, without any interval of time, giving —proceeds commonly from both... From the one from whom the Son has that he is God (for the Son is 'from God,' God), from him he assuredly has that the Holy Spirit also proceed from him; and therefore the Holy Spirit has from the Father that he also proceed from the Son just as he proceeds from the Father." "Now it is clear how the Spirit proceeds from the Father principally, and yet from both commonly. Therefore (he says) I added 'principally,' because the Holy Spirit is also found to proceed from the Son; but this too the Father gave him—not to one already existing and not yet having—but whatever he gave to the Only-Begotten Word, he gave by begetting." "But this is the Spirit 'of both,' because he proceeds from both; yet when the Son spoke of him, he said, 'he proceeds from the Father,' because the Father is the author of his procession, who begot such a Son and by begetting gave to him that the Holy Spirit also proceed from him; therefore he is referred to him from whom the Son was born." "He did not say, 'whom the Father will send from me,' just as he said, 'whom I will send to you from the Father,' manifestly showing that the principle (principium) of the whole divinity—or, if it be better said, of the deity—is the Father: therefore, he who proceeds from the Father and from the Son (as he had taught earlier in many places) is referred to him from whom the Son was born." "It must be

confessed that the Father and the Son are the principle of the Holy Spirit, not two principles; but just as the Father and the Son are one God, and relatively to the creature one creator and one Lord, so relatively to the Holy Spirit [they are] one principle; whereas relatively to the creature the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one principle, just as [they are] one creator and one Lord." — August. Trinit. l. XV, nn. 47–48; ibid., n. 29; id. contra Maximin. l. II, c. 14, n. 1; id. Trin. IV, n. 29; ibid., l. V, n. 15.

c) After Macarius had said that Catholics admit two principles of the Holy Spirit by the very fact that they say he proceeds from two distinct persons, he immediately admits that in Catholic doctrine the Father and the Son are one principle by one spiration; and thus he himself acknowledges that the preceding argument about "two principles" is a mere sophism. Yet, by this unity of principle, he now says, "two persons are fused into one," and thus Catholics fall into Sabellianism—at least insofar as they teach that the Father and the Son breathe the Holy Spirit by one indivisible action and are one principle and one author of that same Spirit.

The Sabellians taught that neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit really proceeds from another person, and therefore that there are not in God persons really distinct; rather, that the one hypostasis has, according to a threefold diverse manifestation ad extra, three different names—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—and that these different manifestations can be called three persons (τρία πρόσωπα), that is, three modes by which the one divine hypostasis presents itself to us to be known. Catholics teach, against the Sabellians, that the Son really proceeds from the Father by generation, and that by this relation of origin there are two persons really distinct from each other; they teach, against the Arians, that the Son is distinguished from the Father by the relation of origin alone, by which he proceeds from the Father as from his principle; whereas under all the other

formal aspects that are uncommunicated in the Father and communicated by the Father to the Son—and therefore also under the formal aspect of the spirative power—they are absolutely one; by this one spiration the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son as from his principle, and on that account the Holy Spirit, the third hypostasis, is really distinguished.

But in the Photian doctrine there is contained either Arianism with respect to the persons of the Father and the Son, or Sabellianism with respect to the person of the Son and the Holy Spirit. For either they admit that spiration in the Father is not a real relation to the Son—that is, that the Son does not proceed from the Father by spiration—or they affirm that the Father is really referred to the Son not only under the formal aspect of "Father," that is, by generation, but also by spiration, and thereby is by spiration the principle of the Son. If they say the first, then by simultaneously asserting that spiration is proper to the Father alone and is not communicated to the Son, they thereby affirm that the Father is distinguished from the Son not by the relation of origin alone—by which the Son is begotten of the Father—but also by some perfection not relative to the Son, namely, by the spirative power. But in God every real distinction that is not a distinction by the relation of origin alone, because of God's very simplicity, coincides with a distinction as to essence; in other words, if the Father does not communicate the essence to the Son under every aspect of perfection (with the sole exception of the relation of the Father to the Son)—and therefore does not communicate it under the aspect of the spirative power—then he does not at all communicate the essence, which is one, most simple, and indivisible. Therefore, in the Photian doctrine, by the very negation of the communication of the spirative power from the first person to the second, the communication of the divine essence is implicitly denied, and thus true generation and the true notion of

Father and Son are denied—precisely what the Arians maintain. If, however, they were to say the latter—that by spiration the Father is really referred to the Son, and consequently that the Son proceeds by spiration from the Father—evidently one and the same relation of the Father would be expressed by a twofold name, "generation" and "spiration," and by this relation one single person would be said to proceed, to be called now by the name "Son," now by the name "Holy Spirit"—which is the Sabellian heresy.

d) Macarius argues as follows: "According to the doctrine of the universal Church, the three persons are one only by the common essence; whence it follows that the same unity that the Son has with the Father is also had by the Holy Spirit. But in the doctrine of the Westerners there is a greater unity of the Son with the Father than of the Holy Spirit, because those two are one not by essence alone but also by spiration."

According to the doctrine of the universal Church, which we have often demonstrated, the three persons are one in all those things wherein the opposition of relation does not stand in the way—in other words, in all things except the formal relative aspect of "principle" and of "one proceeding from a principle," by which alone the persons are really distinguished among themselves. Now since all those formal aspects of perfections—and among them the spirative power—in the Father and in the Son, which we distinguish in our consideration (τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ) with foundation in the reality, are really the very most simple divine essence, it is most correct to say that the three persons are one by essence, and are not distinguished except by the relations of origin. Hence, just as one who considers the unity of the Father and the Son according to essence and omnipotence and the other attributes does not assert a greater unity than one who names unity of essence alone, because the infinite essence is omnipotence itself and whatever perfection can be conceived or named, so also one

who names unity according to essence and according to the spirative power does not assert a greater or a different unity than the unity of essence, since that very essence in the Father and the Son is the spiration relative to the person spirated. Therefore, just as the Holy Spirit, by essence—that is, by the whole plenitude of infinite perfection—is one with the Father and the Son, so by that same one essence and plenitude of infinite being the Son is one with the Father and the Spirit, and the Father with the Son and the Spirit.

Macarius's error lies in this, that he thinks spiration adds something real to the divine essence; otherwise he could not say that unity by essence and by spiration is greater than unity by essence alone. But once this foolish error is posited, many other absurdities follow, and not only the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity but even the infinite perfection of the divine essence is subverted. For (a) an essence to which some perfection really distinct can be superadded is evidently not infinite. (b) If spiration is really distinguished from the essence, then paternity and filiation will be distinguished from the same essence no less; whence, since paternity is not in the Son, filiation is not in the Father, and in the Holy Spirit there is neither paternity nor filiation, it follows that in each person there is some perfection that is not in the others—and therefore that the persons are not consubstantial. (c) Hence the three persons would be more perfection than the individuals taken singly; and the individuals would not each be the infinite God. (d) Since in God whatever is really distinct is necessarily a distinct person, from this most elegant Photian doctrine we should have four or five persons: namely, the essence, really distinct paternity, spiration, filiation, procession—that is, God absolutely considered; then the Father as another; another, the spirator; and finally the Son and the Holy Spirit. Away with these trifles worthy of heretical minds!

e) Lastly, the adversary complains that in Catholic doctrine, besides the Trinity, a "duplicity" is introduced. For he says: "Since Catholics say that the Father and the Son are one principle of the Holy Spirit, they constitute the Spirit, who proceeds from the principle, as a second [principle]" (146).

I confess I do not understand what the disputant means by these empty words. Perhaps he is calumniating Catholics as positing a principle of the Holy Spirit distinct from the person of the Father and of the Son, and thus that the Spirit proceeds not from the Father and the Son but from some other principle; for this seems to be suggested by that absurd phrase, "the Father and the Son form one principle." But if this is where the lie tends, he ought to have calumniated us not as introducing a Trinity and a duality, as he says, but simply a quaternity. Moreover, the matter is evident of itself, and already in our Treatise, Th. XXXIV, p. 585, we have disentangled these Macarian quibbles. According to Catholic doctrine there are indeed in the Most Holy Trinity two processions—a duality that the Photians themselves are forced to admit, lest it be immediately understood by all that they deny the Trinity. The difference, however, is this: Catholics teach that the procession of the third person is from the first and the second, and therefore that by the relation of origin—besides which there is none in God, nor can there be asserted without Arianism any real distinction—the Spirit is really distinguished from the Son no less than from the Father. But the Photians, denying the relation of origin between the Son and the Spirit, are thereby convicted of denying that the Spirit, after the Son, is the third person; for (as Gregory of Nyssa has excellently said) beyond the notion of

146 "They introduce duplicity, for they teach that the Father and the Son form (sic) one principle with respect to the Holy Spirit, as his principle; but that the Holy Spirit, with respect to Them, forms a second, as proceeding from this principle."

principle no priority of the Son over the Spirit can be conceived. Indeed, they are convicted of denying the real distinction of the Son and the Holy Spirit, because such a distinction, according to the doctrine of the same Gregory and of all the Fathers, is in God absolutely none other than the relations of the persons among themselves, of the principle and of the one proceeding from the principle. Therefore, duality is not introduced in Catholic but in Photian doctrine—by the denial of the Trinity of persons.

I shall conclude with the words of St Gregory of Nyssa, already cited elsewhere: "Our doctrine about the Holy Spirit is the same (as that about the relation between the Father and the Son), placing the distinction in order alone. For just as the Son is conjoined to the Father and, having his being from him, is nevertheless not posterior in hypostasis, so in turn the Holy Spirit depends upon the Only-Begotten; for by thought alone, according to the account of principle, the Only-Begotten is preconsidered to the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit... so that, the notion of principle excepted, the holy Trinity is in no way distinguished within itself" (147) (Nyssen. contra Eunomium, l. I, at the end).

CHAPTER II.

ON THE CORRUPTIONS OF TEXTS THAT THE PHOTIANS CHARGE AGAINST LATIN THEOLOGIANS

147 Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς ἡμῖν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λόγος ἐν μόνῃ τῇ τάξει τὴν διαφορὰν ἔχων. Ὡς γὰρ συνάπτεται τῷ πατρὶ ὁ υἱός, οὐδὲν ὕστερος τῇ ὑποστάσει τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶναι ἔχων, οὕτω πάλιν καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἔχεται τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἐπινοίᾳ μόνῃ κατὰ τὸν τῆς αἰτίας λόγον προθεωρουμένου τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος ὑποστάσεως, ὥστε τοῦ λόγου τῆς αἰτίας ὑπεξῃρημένου, ἐν μηδενὶ τὴν ἁγίαν Τριάδα πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἀσυμφώνως ἔχειν.

We proceed to the second topic, concerning the "corruptions of texts" and "the frauds of the Latins"—a slander whose source, as once in the apostate Theophan Prokopowicz, so now in Macarius, was that eminently crafty man Adam Zoernikaw. Macarius himself, very much against the grain of good sense, added a few things of his own invention.

1° The Photians could not be unaware that, so far as doctrine is concerned, the very first origin of their sect owes, at least in large part, its existence to the impostures and corruptions of Photius, who has been proved—even to the point of evident demonstration—to have corrupted public documents, the letters of the Supreme Pontiffs St. Nicholas I and John VIII, to have interpolated for his own purposes the acts of councils, or even to have fabricated them outright, as we showed above (148). This Greek "good faith" has passed from the first author of the schism to his posterity as by hereditary right—or rather as by original sin (149). For the outspoken passages of Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Epiphanius on the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son were, after the schism had been concocted, obliterated by the Greeks; this was laid bare by Patriarch Beccus, by

---

148 St. Nicholas I, ep. 9 to the Emperor Michael, complaining about the corruption of his letters, says that such frauds are familiar among the Greeks: apud Graecos, sicuti nonnulla diversi temporis scripta testantur, familiaris est ista temeritas (Mansi XV, p. 224). Long before, St. Gregory the Great had warned about Greek impostures: "The Roman codices are much truer than the Greek, because we do not have your (the Greeks') devices—and so neither your impostures." l. VI (al. V), ep. 14 to Narses the Patrician. See more examples cited in the Council of Florence, session XX, Mansi XXXI, pp. 770ff.

149 You may find described in Hergenröther's Historia Photii several monuments of the stupid imposture of Greeklings and Muscovites: vol. III–1, book X, § 10, p. 843ff.

Bessarion, by Joseph of Methone, by Constantine Meliteniotes, and by others, from the very manuscripts in which erasures were found (cf. Graecia orthodoxa vol. I, p. 134, 366ff.; vol. II, p. 73, 120, 825–854, 864; Hardouin, Conc. IX, p. 567; see more in Hergenröther, Photii mystagogiam Animadv. § II, note 10; Laemmer, Scriptorum graec. Bibliotheca selecta vol. I, pp. 81–86; Hefele, Hist. Concil. vol. VII, pp. 699, 704, 719). Indeed, how much Macarius himself is skilled in this art we have seen above, where, trusting in the ignorance of his readers and following the example of his forebears, he was caught more than once truncating and perverting texts known to all and entirely manifest. Now, however, in order to confirm his accusations, he appeals to men most hostile to the Catholic name—slanderers dearer to him on that very account—besides the schismatic monk Zoernikaw and his compiler Prokopowicz, namely to Protestants: Franciscus Junius, Daniel Francus, Löscher, Cave; and to the apostate Oudin, whom he celebrates as "learned Westerners," so as to lend a more specious gloss.

Everything, however, that he brings forward pertains either to the perversion and denial of genuine texts on the sole ground that one or another codex has a different reading, or else, for the greater part, comes down in the end to this: that certain works exist which are indeed ancient, but were once inscribed under false names of the Fathers, under which the older theologians were accustomed to cite them. Yet assuredly Catholics did not learn the very art of distinguishing genuine works from spurious from Greeklings or Russians. And if an immense abundance of genuine testimonies be passed over in silence, or if citations be made from them in truncated fashion, and then there be a great outcry about "frauds perpetrated," because the same dogma is found expressed not only in genuine works but also in spurious—by this method of his Macarius will deprive his compatriots not only of the dogma of the procession of the Holy

Spirit from the Father and the Son, but of the entire Christian faith. Nonetheless, let us examine one by one the "corruptions" that are said to have been introduced by Latin fraud.

2° The testimonies which he says are falsely attributed to the Fathers he recites as follows.

a) The legates sent from the Council of Aachen to Pope Leo III reported, as though it were Jerome's wording from an Exposition of the Creed, the following, which (he says) is found nowhere: "The Spirit, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, is coeternal and in all things equal to the Father and the Son."

But from whatever source the words were taken, the profession itself, as to its sense, exists in full in the Exposition of the Creed once attributed by many to Jerome but in fact by Rufinus, a contemporary of Jerome. Rufinus's words, in the Vallarsi edition, are these: "Let him be understood as the Father, from whom are all things, and because he himself does not have a Father; let him be understood as the Son, as the one who was born of the Father; and as

the Holy Spirit, as proceeding from both (150) and sanctifying all things. But in order that one and the same divinity may be taught in the Trinity, as it has been said—to believe in God the Father... so also in Christ his Son, so also the Holy Spirit is mentioned." (Expos. symbol. n. 35; Migne, vol. XXI, p. 372).

b) Macarius, borrowing from his Zoernikaw, describes a second "Latin fraud" as perpetrated at the Council of Florence, where the Latin theologian John, Provincial Master of the Order of Preachers in Lombardy (151), is said to have cited from a profession of faith of Pope Damasus the spurious words: "We believe... in the Holy

---

150 Vallarsi vindicates this as the genuine reading, rejecting the other—tamquam de Dei ore procedens—which (he says) "seems to have been fabricated by a later hand," although it can be referred to the same sense according to the doctrine of the Fathers, for whom "the mouth of the Father" is the Son. In the same way in which the legates of Aachen cited the words, St. Peter Damian (Opusc. 38, De Processione Spiritus Sancti c. 5) cites them; and, in accordance with his well-known sincerity, he adds: "although this cannot be found in his Exposition of the Faith, namely in that which we read." In fact, St. Peter did not have this work of Rufinus in view, but another Exposition of the Faith of Jerome to Alypius and Augustine, which he cites in c. 2, and in which it was said only: "We believe in the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father." This Exposition of the Faith to Alypius and Augustine—of which Damian speaks—is none other than the little book of faith sent by the heretic Pelagius to Pope Innocent I; this will be clear to anyone comparing the words cited by Damian in c. 2 with Pelagius's text. This profession of Pelagius once existed under the name of Explanation of the Faith among the Works of Jerome. See Opera Hieronymi, ed. Vallarsi, vol. XI, p. 146.

151 Our "most learned" Macarius calls him "Jean de Provence" (p. 392), as if the office of Provincial had been exchanged for the most beautiful province of Gaul.

Spirit, who is neither Father nor Son, but proceeds from the Father and the Son."

These words, to be sure, are not found in the letter of Damasus to Paulinus which Theodoret reports (H. E. V, 11); nor shall we say that the genuine reading must be taken from the Cresconian collection of canons (see Baronius, year 867, n. 68). But a "Latin fraud" will not be found here except this great one: that a profession of faith—certainly ancient, though not of Damasus, in whose name it is inscribed—was still in the fifteenth century thought to be by that Pope; which, in the end, is an error of attribution. In that profession, however, one reads thus: "We believe... the Holy Spirit—neither begotten nor unbegotten, neither created nor made—but proceeding from the Father and the Son." (Coustant, Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum, Appendix, p. 101.) You have the same doctrine in the genuine Explanation of the Faith made in the Council of the City of Rome under Pope Damasus, which Holstenius edited: "The Holy Spirit is not the Spirit of the Father only nor of the Son only, but the Spirit of the Father and of the Son (this is proved from the texts of Scripture)... Therefore, when the Father and the Son are named, the Holy Spirit is understood, of whom the Son himself says in the Gospel: that the Spirit proceeds from the Father; and: he will receive from what is mine and will declare it to you" (Migne XIII, p. 374). Hence Alexius Aristenus, the Greek interpreter of the canons of the twelfth century—or another George Aristenus—and from him Joseph of Methone and, in the fifteenth century, the Patriarch Simeon (see Allatius, Contra Hottinger c. 18, 20; and Lequien, Dissert. Damasc. I, n. 26) report that "Damasus, together with the Catholic bishops subject to him, convened a council at Rome, who in the holy Nicene Creed added that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son" (Migne, loc. cit., p. 245).

c) Finally, Macarius, appealing to the apostate Casimir Oudin, accuses St. Thomas Aquinas of having actually presumed to cite false testimonies of the Fathers, "especially in the Opuscule against the Greeks."

But in the citations of that little work St. Thomas presumed absolutely nothing. A booklet containing many testimonies of the holy Fathers—most of them genuine, some inscribed under false names—had been brought by someone to Pope Urban IV, who sent it to Aquinas, not to be sure so that he would distinguish genuine texts from spurious, but so that he would examine the doctrine expressed in those testimonies: whoever their authors might turn out to be, whether that doctrine were Catholic, and what fruit might be drawn from it for the elucidation of the Catholic faith. St. Thomas, therefore —taking on for himself not the task of critical dissection but that of theological interpretation—accepted on the faith of the compiler the names of the Fathers under which he found the individual texts attributed in the booklet, intent on this one thing alone: to show the Catholic sense of the testimonies. For whether the authors were those under whose names they were inscribed, or others, neither the sense of the words nor the defense of Catholic truth depended on that. And indeed we have long known that the texts which the Photian objects are not by Athanasius, to whom they were attributed in the booklet (152); but there are very many authentic testimonies of Athanasius—and not a few of these were cited even in the same booklet—by which

152 Macarius, together with St. Thomas, also accuses Bellarmine of a false citation; but Bellarmine (De Christo II, c. 28) says that he adduces the testimony "as it is in St. Thomas." Namely, just as St. Thomas does, so Bellarmine and other scholastics who transcribed it ultimately remit us to the authority of the one who had presented to Urban IV the collected testimonies. How prone such collectors are to err in names—by skipping from one to another—is clear from the so-called "Catenae of the Fathers."

the Catholic teaching of the holy Doctor of Alexandria on the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son is clearly set forth, as we have demonstrated in our Treatise on the Trinity. See the absurd calumnies of Oudin—which Macarius repeats with his predecessors—refuted in the critical dissertations of Giovanni Bernardo De' Rossi (De Rubeis), diss. V, c. 4, n. 3; diss. XIX, c. 2. For that collection of testimonies see also Lequien, Praefatio to the Works of St. John Damascene, p. X.

3º Besides those texts just mentioned, which he calls "spurious," Macarius adduces testimonies of the Fathers which he charges the Latins with having "corrupted"; but in point of fact, in most cases nothing else lies hidden there except that certain writers, when citing passages of the Fathers, intended not so much to transcribe the words as to express more clearly the genuine sense. If such things are to be accused as "fraud," then the very version of Scripture used by the Greeks and Russians will plainly be found replete with such "frauds."

a) First, with respect to the discourse of Gregory of Nyssa (In orationem dominicam), where the Holy Spirit is said to be "of the Father," and is confirmed at the same time "also from the Son" (καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ συμμαρτυρεῖται); in like manner, with respect to the celebrated testimony of Basil (Contra Eunomium III, 1), the charge of "corruption" rebounds upon the schismatics; because, especially after the new labors of Maran and Cardinal Mai, one must judge that the genuine reading of the Catholics persisted in both places in the manuscripts—of which several still survive—right up until the

consolidation of the schism ([153]). We have said enough elsewhere about these matters (Tractatus de Trinitate, ed. 2, pp. 523ff.; and above, pp. 129ff.).

b) Next, set aside what the Photian inserts about the "corrupted" text of Pope St. Hormisdas, in epistle 79 to the Emperor Justin, and of Didymus, in his On the Holy Spirit n. 34, from the translation of St. Jerome; for both passages are proved altogether genuine by the critical editions, and the prattle of Zoernikaw and from him of Theophan Prokopowicz and Macarius has no weight. See on Hormisdas in the Tractatus de Trinitate, ed. 2, p. 509; on the text and context of Didymus, above p. 45.

c) Furthermore, set aside the ranters' declamations about the text of St. Augustine (Trin. V, c. 11), which Peter Lombard (Sent. I, dist. 18) is said to have "corrupted." We have expounded Augustine's luminous doctrine (Tract. de Trin. Th. XXXV, n. II), so that it is not the Catholic theologians but the Photians who have need of "corruptions"—by the perpetration of which Macarius has been so bold as to assert that "the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son was directly repudiated by Augustine." In that very context whence the interpolation is alleged, the holy Doctor declares in express words that "the Father and the Son are one

---

[153] Our Photian accuses Patriarch Beccus and Emmanuel Calecas of interpolating the particle ἐκ ("two deserters of orthodoxy, Beccus and Palecas, who wrote in favor of the false Roman dogma"). But how, pray, could Beccus and Calecas (whom Macarius—or his translator—everywhere calls "Palecas"), men living respectively in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, have written manuscripts older than the ninth century in which the particle ἐκ stands intact? In fact, Beccus, in a synod of bishops and princes, proved that the particle had been erased by the schismatics with malicious intent: hence their rage!

principle of the Holy Spirit" (154). The entire "offense" of Lombard—in that same distinction 18, where he sets out many other explicit testimonies of Augustine—comes down to this alone: that he condensed a longer context of the holy Doctor into fewer words.

d) Likewise, set aside the accusation of "corruption" in the Explanation of the Faith to Cyril, once ascribed to Jerome. Not only in the more ancient editions, but even in the critical editions of Martianay and Vallarsi, the text is read complete: "We find in Scripture that the Holy Spirit... is properly 'of the Father'... from the Father [is] the Son, and the Holy Spirit properly and truly proceeds from the Father and the Son. First, therefore, take that the Holy Spirit is properly 'of the Father,' as Scripture says, etc." (Migne, vol. XXX, p. 179). Now what the Photian brings forward to prove "corruption"—from Peter Damian, De Spiritu Sancto c. 2, and from Peter Lombard, Sent. I, dist. 12, whom he says did not read that Filioque—hold that to be sheer imposture. First, it would matter little if, in the twelfth century, a few faulty codices had existed; secondly, it is by no means proved that those two Doctors had another reading of this passage. For Peter Damian cites another Exposition of the Faith, by Jerome, "to the bishops Alypius and Augustine," and from it words altogether other (155) than those that are in the Explanation to Cyril. Lombard, moreover, had the purpose of explaining in what sense the Holy Spirit is said to proceed "principally" and "properly" from the Father; to

---

154 We transcribed the place in the Tractatus de Trinitate, p. 506.

155 "Blessed indeed Jerome, in the Exposition of the Faith which he sends to the bishops Alypius and Augustine, among other things says thus: 'We believe also in the Holy Spirit, the true Lord, proceeding from the Father, equal in all things to the Father and the Son'" (Peter Damian, loc. cit.). We have already noted above that this Exposition of the Faith is by the heretic Pelagius, and it differs altogether from the other work which is inscribed to Cyril.

that end, the particle Filioque contributed nothing—indeed, it was to be omitted—so that the adverb proprie might be understood as pertaining to the Father. Macarius lies, along with his associates, when he says that this master anxiously asks why Jerome omitted the particle Filioque (156). See also Petavius, VII, c. 10, nn. 12–13.

e) Finally, set aside the laughable accusation that the Latins, by interpolating the letters of Photius, foisted upon that very "heroic" man the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit "also from the Son." No Latin has ever doubted that the origin of the heresy—at least so far as it coalesced into an Eastern sect—is owed to Photius; on what grounds, then, could the thought have come to them to interpolate his writings in order to make him appear a defender of the

156 "Pierre Lombard, after having cited this same passage of St. Jerome and two similar ones, asks with anxiety: 'why then did Jerome, after saying that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, not add: and from the Son?' cur Hieronymus dixerit Spiritum Sanctum a Patre procedere proprie, non addito Filio? Sent. I, dist. 12." Thus Macarius (p. 396). But while the Photian is accusing the Latins of "corruption," in the accusation itself he manifestly corrupts Lombard's text, which by no means says what Macarius fabricates in Latin and in the vernacular; Lombard's words are these: "In the same sense (as 'to proceed principally from the Father'), it is also said that he proceeds 'properly' from the Father. Whence Jerome says: 'We believe in the Holy Spirit, who proceeds properly from the Father.' Likewise: 'We find in Scripture that the Holy Spirit is the true God and of the Father properly.' And again: 'From the Father [is] the Son, and the Holy Spirit properly and truly proceeds from the Father.' Behold, he says plainly that the Holy Spirit is properly of the Father, and properly proceeds from the Father. This is not to be understood as if he first or more fully proceeded from the Father than from the Son; but because the Father has this from himself, not from another, that the Holy Spirit should be of him and proceed from him; while the Son does not have this from himself, but from the Father—that the Holy Spirit should be of him and proceed from him." (Sent. I, dist. 12).

Catholic dogma? Zoernikaw, and from him Macarius, tells that Henricus Canisius, in a manuscript, found the Constantinopolitan Creed—which Photius had inserted in his letter to Michael, prince of the Bulgars (ep. 8 in Migne, vol. CII, p. 630)—interpolated by the addition of the particle Filioque. But this little tale is of the slightest importance and bears no fruit. Know that the boasted "manuscript" was nothing other than a slip of paper by Franciscus Turrianus, who did not mean to ascribe that profession to Photius but intended, in his Latin version, to adapt the Creed to the form of the Western Church; hence Canisius ordered the word Filioque to be printed in smaller letters, lest some unskilled person perhaps suspect that it was to be attributed to Photius. See the learned Laemmer, loc. cit., p. 47.

4º There follow three testimonies in which Macarius, with his associates, reproaches the Latins for "interpolation"; but in reality the whole "Latin poison" lies in this—that, in two texts of Athanasius, the genuine sense was rendered more expressly in Latin translation, and in a third testimony of Ambrose the wording was abridged.

a) Ambrose explains how, in Matthew 1:18, the Blessed Virgin is said to have been "found with child of the Holy Spirit." The particle of (ex), he says, indicates origin either "from substance"—and thus "from the Father is the Son; from the Father and the Son is the Holy Spirit"—or it indicates origin "from power and operation," and thus "from the Holy Spirit the Blessed Virgin conceived." "Whatever is of someone is either of his substance or of his power (157). Of his substance, as the Son, who says: 'I went forth from the mouth of the Most High'; as the Spirit, who proceeds from the Father (John 15:26), of whom the Son says: 'He will glorify me, for he will receive

157 Macarius—or his French translator—failing to understand this, renders it foolishly: "Ce qui est d'un homme, est de son essence ou de son pouvoir; de l'essence, comme le Fils, qui est du Père," etc.

from what is mine' (John 16:14); but of his power, as in that saying: 'One God the Father, from whom are all things.' How, then, did Mary have in her womb of the Holy Spirit?... It was as if by his operation and power that the Virgin conceived." (De Spiritu Sancto II, c. 5, n. 42). It is evident that Ambrose, by two evangelical texts, shows of whose substance the Holy Spirit is: namely, he is of the substance of the Father according to John 15:26, and of the substance of the Son according to John 16:14. He shows this second point again in the same way a little below (c. 12, n. 134): "The Son received all things from the Father, because he himself said... 'All things that the Father has are mine' (John 16:15); and what he (the Son) has received by the unity of nature, from him, by the same unity, the Spirit also has received; as the Lord Jesus himself declares, speaking of his Spirit: 'Therefore I said, he will receive from what is mine and declare it to you'" (ibid.).

Now listen to the "crime." Peter Lombard condensed this longer passage (from chapter 2) into a compendium, while keeping the genuine sense intact; and this is the whole great "crime" about which the Photians stage their tragedies. There can no longer be any talk of "fraud," for Lombard does not even use Ambrose's words to prove the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, but to prove "that Christ is said, according to his humanity, to have been born 'of the Holy Spirit' because the Spirit brought it about." The Master's compendium reads thus: "Giving the reason for the saying ('she was found to be with child of the Holy Spirit'), Ambrose says: 'Whatever is of someone is either of his substance or of his power; of his substance, as the Son, who is 'of the Father,' and the Holy Spirit, who proceeds 'from the Father and the Son'; of his power, however, as 'all things are from God.' Therefore, since Mary had in her womb 'of' the Holy Spirit... it was as if by his operation and power that the Virgin conceived." (Sent. III, dist. 4).

b) In order to understand the charge of "interpolation" in the testimonies of Athanasius, we must keep before our eyes the context and Athanasius's manner of speaking, which is solemn and proper to him. In many places Athanasius explains the relation of the Son to the Father, and of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son, by images, some of which we have set out from Epistle I to Serapion in the Tractatus de Trinitate (ed. 2, p. 468). One of these images—derived from Scripture itself—is that in which the Father is called "light" (φῶς), the Son "radiance/splendor" (ἀπαύγασμα), the Spirit "illumination" (φωτισμός); or, in another way, the Father is called "sun," the Son "splendor from the sun," the Holy Spirit "light" or "illumination from the sun in its splendor," i.e., from the Father and the Son as one. This comparison is familiar also to other Doctors, such as Tertullian, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nyssa (whom we have cited: ibid., pp. 494, 518, 541; and above in this appendix, pp. 95–96, note), Anastasius of Antioch (above, pp. 65–66), and others. "For indeed" (says Athanasius, speaking of the Father and the Son), "the splendor itself is also light—neither a second light, nor a light other than the sun, nor merely a participation of it, but its entire proper offspring. And such an offspring is necessarily one light; nor can anyone say that those two are two lights, but that they are two—sun and splendor—whereas the one light, from the sun in the splendor, illumines all things" (158) (Orat. III contra Arianos n. 4). In this, he includes the Holy Spirit only implicitly, whom he then a little below explicitly declares to be "illumination from the sun in the splendor." "Divine Scripture has furnished us with examples of this sort (of sun,

158 Καὶ γὰρ καὶ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα φῶς ἐστιν, οὐ δεύτερον τοῦ ἡλίου, οὐδὲ ἕτερον φῶς, οὐδὲ κατὰ μετουσίαν αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ ὅλον ἴδιον αὐτοῦ γέννημα. Τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον γέννημα ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἕν ἐστι φῶς· καὶ οὐκ ἄν τις εἴποι δύο φῶτα εἶναι ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ δύο μὲν ἥλιον καὶ ἀπαύγασμα, ἕν δὲ τὸ ἐξ ἡλίου φῶς ἐν τῷ ἀπαυγάσματι φωτίζον τὰ πανταχοῦ.

splendor, illumination), as we said above, by which we can refute both the perfidious Jews and the slander of the Gentiles who say and opine that we too, on account of the Trinity, proclaim many gods. For neither—as the proposed example shows—do we introduce three principles or three Fathers, as did Marcionites and Manichees, since we have not proposed three suns for our example, but the sun and the splendor, and the one light from the sun in the splendor... One God the Father, existing in himself as the one who is 'over all,' manifested in the Son as the one who 'penetrates through all,' and in the Spirit as the one who, 'in all,' operates through the Word in the Spirit himself (cf. Eph 4:6). Thus do we confess, through the Trinity, that there is one God" (159) (ibid., n. 15). You see here that, in order to make clear the unity of essence—from the Father in the Son, from the Father and the Son (that is, from the Father as he is one with the Son) in the Holy Spirit—the three persons are set forth as sun, splendor, light. The splendor shining from the sun is one with the sun; from the sun in the splendor, i.e., from the Father in the Son begotten by immanent generation—and thus insofar as the Father and the Son are one—the light radiates, i.e., the Holy Spirit proceeds.

Comparing, then, the three formulas—"from the Father through the Son," "from the Father in the Son," "from the Father and the Son"—as to the reality signified, they say precisely the same; as to their mode of signifying, the second is the mean between the first and the third. For with the first (see the Treatise on the Trinity, Th. XXXVI) it agrees in declaring the distinction and relation of the Father and the Son; with the third, it agrees in expressing more clearly

159 Ἐπεὶ μηδὲ τριῶν ἡλίων ὑπεθέμεθα τὴν εἰκόνα, ἀλλὰ ἥλιον καὶ ἀπαύγασμα, καὶ ἕν τὸ ἐξ ἡλίου ἐν τῷ ἀπαυγάσματι φῶς... εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ ὢν κατὰ τὸ ἐπὶ πάντων εἶναι, καὶ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ φαινόμενος κατὰ τὸ διὰ πάντων διέναι, καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι κατὰ τὸ ἐν ἅπασι διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνεργεῖν.

the unity of principle, since the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son not insofar as they are distinguished but insofar as, by the spirative power, they are one.

Consider also, on the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Father in the Son," Cyril, Athanasius's successor, in the place I cited above, p. 154.

Now, the whole "fraud of the Latins" which Zoernikaw and from him Macarius allege comes down to this one thing: that the Latin translator, in the Basel edition and the earlier Paris edition, substituted for the formula "from the sun in the splendor" the other formula "from the sun and the splendor," or rather expressed briefly that "from the sun in the splendor" by circumscribing, "from both"; for he translated, as to the sense and quite correctly: "since we do not bring forward three suns for comparison, but one single sun and its splendor, and from both the light proceeding," or (in Bellarmine, De Christo II, c. 25) "and one light from both."

c) A very similar passage occurs in Athanasius's Epistle I to Serapion, nn. 19–21, from which we have transcribed some parts in the Tractatus de Trinitate Th. XXXIII, p. 468. But since, in this very testimony of Athanasius, Macarius accuses St. Thomas of "corruption," the context must again be set before our eyes that—if it be possible—the Photians may repent of their accusation.

"The Father," he says, "is called fountain and light (160); but the Son, when referred to the fountain, is called river; when referred to the light, he is called splendor. Since, therefore, the Father is light and the Son his splendor, it is permissible also to discern the Spirit in the Son, in whom we are illumined... In like manner, as the Father is

---

160 Athanasius, in this whole passage drawing comparisons from the words of Scripture, adduces sacred texts in the several clauses; for the sake of brevity we omit them here.

the fountain and the Son is called the river, so we are said to drink the Spirit (161)... Next, since the Father, as Paul teaches, is 'only wise,' the Son is his Wisdom; but since the Son is Wisdom, we, receiving the Spirit of Wisdom, have the Son (162)... And again, just as the Son said that the works he did the Father does: 'The Father, abiding in me, does his works. Believe me, that I am in the Father and the Father in me; or else believe for the sake of the works themselves' (John 14:10–11); so too Paul, the things he accomplished in the power of the Spirit, used to say are the works of Christ: 'For I will not dare to speak of anything except what Christ has wrought through me... in the power of the Holy Spirit' (Rom 15:18–19)." Then, after interjecting a few Arian difficulties against the unity of nature in the three distinct persons, Athanasius replies to them by declaring the communication of the one nature: from the Father to the Son, from the Father and the Son to the Holy Spirit. "This kind of hesitation," he says, "can most of all be healed by faith, then also by the aforesaid examples of image, splendor, fountain, river, substance and impress (from Heb 1:3); for, as the Son is in his own image, namely in the Spirit, so also the Father is in the Son (as in his own Image)... that we may believe there is one sanctity which is communicated from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit (163)... For since the Son is one—the living

161 Τοῦ τοίνυν πατρὸς φωτὸς ὄντος, τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ ἀπαυγάσματος αὐτοῦ, ἔξεστιν ὁρᾶν καὶ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἐν ᾧ φωτιζόμεθα... πάλιν δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς πηγῆς, τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ ποταμοῦ λεγομένου, πίνειν λεγόμεθα τὸ πνεῦμα.

162 Τοῦ πατρὸς μόνου σοφοῦ ὄντος... ὁ υἱὸς ἐστιν ἡ σοφία... τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ ὄντος τῆς σοφίας, ἡμεῖς πνεῦμα σοφίας λαμβάνοντες, τὸν υἱὸν ἔχομεν.

163 Basil, De Spiritu Sancto n. 47, has this twofold statement: ἡ φυσικὴ ἀγαθότης καὶ ὁ κατὰ φύσιν ἁγιασμὸς καὶ τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀξίωμα ἐκ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἐπὶ τὸ πνεῦμα διήκει. And Athanasius himself, Contra Arianos Or. III, n. 24, says: "whatever the Spirit has, he has from the Word" (καὶ ὅσα ἔχει τὸ πνεῦμα, παρὰ τοῦ λόγου ἔχει).

Word—it is necessary that there be one, perfect and full, life-giving and enlightening power and gift of his (namely, the Spirit of the Son), which is said to proceed from the Father, because it shines forth from, and is sent and given by, the Word, who is confessed to be 'from the Father.' The Son is sent by the Father; but the Son sends the Spirit. The Son glorifies the Father; the Spirit glorifies the Son. The Son says: 'What I heard from the Father, these I speak in the world'; but the Spirit receives from the Son: 'He will receive from what is mine,' he says, 'and will declare it to you.' The Son comes in the name of the Father; 'the Holy Spirit,' says the Son, 'the Father will send in my name.' Since, therefore, the Spirit has the same order and the same nature (and the same natural relation) to the Son as the Son has to the Father ([164]), how can the one who says that the Spirit is a created thing not necessarily think the same about the Son? For if the Spirit of the Son is a creature, it will follow that they also say that the Word of the Father is a creature." (Ep. I ad Serap. nn. 19–21).

Here the relation of origin of the Holy Spirit to the Son—as also, because the Son is "from the Father," the one and the same relation to the Father and the Son—cannot be expressed more brilliantly than it is here described by the great Athanasius. See the Tractatus de Trinitate, loc. cit.

Now let us examine the "corruption" of this remarkable passage, which Macarius, with his associates, foists upon St. Thomas. The whole "fraud of the Latins" consists in the translation or explanation of a single clause. Athanasius's words were cited above: "Just as the Son said that the works he did the Father does... so too Paul used to say that the things he accomplished in the power of the

[164] The same in Basil, Contra Eunomium V (vol. I, p. 304).

Spirit are the works of Christ" ([165]). Now, what, I ask, is the sense of this clause from the whole context? The Son (says Athanasius) calls his works the works of the Father, in order to declare his relation of origin from the Father; but Paul, in like manner, calls the works of the Holy Spirit the works of Christ the Son; therefore the same is the relation of origin—or, as Athanasius speaks, the same order and the same nature—of the Holy Spirit to the Son as of the Son to the Father. Whence—not St. Thomas, but the one who had offered to Pope Urban IV the collection of testimonies from the holy Fathers—condensed this passage of Athanasius, in its altogether genuine sense, and at the same time explained it thus: "The Apostle attributes to the Son—its author—what the Spirit works and accomplishes in him; just as the Son attributes to his author, God the Father, the works that he himself does." St. Thomas, in turn, did nothing other than transcribe the passage as he found it in the collection handed on to him, and he set forth the argument contained therein without doubt for the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son (Opusc. contra errores Graecorum c. 32).

5° One last rhetorical flourish of Macarius remains, concerning a "corrupted" passage of John Damascene. The whole matter comes down to this. There exists a Life of Saints Barlaam and Josaphat ascribed to the author John Damascene; and a Latin version of the same, falsely attributed to George of Trebizond, came to light in the sixteenth century, "over-corrected." That man—neither a good translator nor a theologian—judged that the suspicion of Photian heresy should be removed from the author of that Life; and therefore where the little work (c. 19), in agreement with countless Greek and

---

[165] Ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς ἅπερ ἐποίει ἔργα, ἔλεγε τὸν πατέρα ἐργάζεσθαι... οὕτως ἅπερ ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος εἰργάζετο ὁ Παῦλος, ἔλεγε τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἶναι τὰ ἔργα (ibid., n. 19, at the end).

Latin Fathers and with the Creed itself—indeed with the Gospel itself—has: ἓν πνεῦμα ἅγιον, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, he, foolishly thinking that the text needed "correction" (166), set down in his version: "the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son." The fruit of this over-scrupulousness among Catholics was not that they appealed to that version for the confirmation of dogma; rather, learned men—among whom Bellarmine (De Scriptoribus Eccles. "De S. Io. Damasceno")—judged either that the passage was interpolated, or that the little work could not have Damascene as its author, because, among the two formulas—"procession from the Father and the Son," and "from the Father through the Son"—it is

166 Without doubt M. Boissonade is also mistaken, who in his edition of this Life (Paris, 1832) seemed to suspect a schismatic author under that sentence (Migne XCVI, p. 1027, notes 95–96).

established that only the latter was in use by Damascene (167). The Greek text always remained intact, which James Billius, shortly after that earlier version (1577), also rendered faithfully in his own Latin translation. On the author of that History and on the Latin version, see Allatius, Prolegomena to St. John Damascene, nn. 44–53 (Migne XCIV, pp. 151ff.).

These are the "more manifest proofs of corruptions perpetrated by the Latins" which Macarius, with the trumpeting vainglory typical of impostors who mock the ignorance of simple

---

167 "Because, when Barlaam instructs his disciple Josaphat," says Bellarmine, "he orders him to believe in the Holy Spirit ex Patre et Filio procedentem, a doubt has arisen whether this work could be by John Damascene, who (I, 11 De Fide Orthodoxa) teaches that the Holy Spirit does not proceed ex Filio but per Filium. But one can answer (in order to vindicate the work for Damascene) that, in the History of Barlaam, that particle ex Filio seems to have been added by someone; for in the new edition of Billius it is not found." Allatius discusses the same point at length. The Photian calumniates when he alleges this: "The Jesuit Antonio Possevino, following certain editions of St. John Damascene, cites from the History of Barlaam and Josaphat (ch. 19), known under his name, the following expression: 'reconnais le seul Saint-Esprit, qui procéde du Père et du Fils.'" But Possevino brings forward nothing at all about that Life of Barlaam except that the edition of Billius (which does not have the addition et Filio) should be preferred to the others (Possevino, Apparatus, s.v. Ioannes Damascenus, vol. II, p. 164, ed. Venice 1606). No less odious and false are the claims he makes about Bellarmine and Allatius, as if these most learned men, only after Billius's edition, were forced to recognize the error. After he has mentioned Billius's edition without the particle et Filio, he adds: "après cela Bellarmin lui-même et le plus perfide adversaire de l'Eglise orthodoxe (i.e., the one who showed most clearly the perfidy of the schismatics), Léon Allatius, furent forcés de reconnaître pour altéré le passage cité" (Macarius, p. 396).

folk, produced from the monk of Baturyn, Zoernikaw, and from his plunderer Theophan Prokopowicz. The remaining items of the same flour from the Zoernikavian hodgepodge—which Macarius himself thought best to consign to silence—I shall not touch here; for their refutation, if anyone desires it, Dr. Hugo Laemmer will provide a compendium in the work cited.

We have sifted everything that a bishop—celebrated among his own as a man of learning—could discover, with the full keenness of his talent, as arguments to attack a dogma of the Catholic faith and to stabilize an heretical opinion: that which was first introduced by the sacrilegious ambition of Photius, then revived by the same proud passion of subsequent patriarchs and Eastern prelates, and finally confirmed by the harsher tyranny of Byzantine and more recently Russian rulers—exercised not only by scourges and exiles, sword and blood, against Catholic faithful, but no less by the profane largesse of honors and offices toward sectarians and apostates; and this not because they are greatly concerned about the dogma itself in itself, but so that, by division of heresy, they may have an "imperial synagogue," dependent on their nod in the mode and measure of its liberty, trampled under their feet in the abjection of servitude. Would that those who among Catholics, in the storm of persecution, are nearer to shipwreck concerning the faith, and those who among the schismatics in good will desire the harbor of the true faith, with the eyes of their mind illumined by the light of grace, would clearly perceive that the matter at stake is the highest matter—namely, the very mystery of the Most Holy Trinity, which Tertullian calls "the substance of the New Testament," and Gregory Nazianzen "the companion and patroness of our whole life" (Tertullian, Contra Praxean c. 31; Nazianzen, Or. 40, n. 41). But this very principal mystery of the Christian faith is entirely subverted if it is not held in all its points, as it is proclaimed to be believed in the revelation of Scripture and Tradition, explained

according to the Catholic understanding and the ecclesial sense. We have demonstrated that this subversion of the mystery is contained in the doctrine of the Eastern schism: in the Treatise on the Trinity by expounding the Catholic faith on the procession of the Holy Spirit from all the documents of revelation; and, in the present inquiry, by examining the force, sense, and foundations of the Photian innovation which—as it was first fabricated by its author—cannot be sustained by its followers in any other way except by the denial, concealment, or truncation of all Catholic monuments—of Scripture, of creeds, of Councils, of the doctrine of the Fathers—and, moreover, by the diversion, to an alien sense, of even the clearest statements.

May the Spirit of truth and of wisdom—eternally proceeding, in one truth and wisdom, from the Father and the Son, Truth and Wisdom—and sent in time to teach all truth and impart the gift of wisdom, open the hearts of those who err, to attend to what is said by the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, to which that very Spirit of truth was promised and sent, that he might abide with her forever.

SCHOLIA

ON THE NEOPHOTIAN DISSERTATION OF JOSEPH LANGEN CONCERNING THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

After I had already for some time brought my Examination of the Macarian doctrine to its close, there fell into my hands, on the same subject yet treating it by another method, from other principles, and with another aim, a small work by Joseph Langen—a man who, an apostate from the Catholic Church to Neoprotestantism, with the favor of the persecutors of the Church retains the stipend and the title of Professor of Catholic Theology (168)—turning, namely, the very name of "defense" into the "assault" of Catholic theology.

The errors in this Langenean investigation are many and grave, not only in the interpretation of the doctrine of Scripture and the Fathers on the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and

168 The pamphlet is entitled: De dissidio inter occidentalem et orientalem Ecclesiam in doctrina de Trinitate. Die Trinitarische Lehrdifferenz zwischen der abendlaendischen und morgenlaendischen Kirche. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung von Dr. Joseph Langen, ordentl. Professor der katholischen Theologie an der Universitaet Bonn. Bonn 1876.

the Son, or from the Father through the Son; in the explication of the genuine sense of this revealed dogma; in the estimation of its value; and consequently in the declaration of the whole mystery of the Most Holy Trinity; but above all in the subversion of the formal principle of the Catholic Church—indeed, I say, in the subversion of the indefectible and infallible magisterium both for the preservation and for the explication of the entire deposit of revelation, under the assistance and leading into all truth by the Spirit of truth, who remains with the Church forever; the denial of whose indefectibility and infallibility is the very form, alone consistently retained, not less of this new faction of Neoprotestants than of all Protestantism in its otherwise most diverse sects, and at the same time the origin and overflowing source of all other errors, however much they may differ among themselves.

CHAPTER I.

A SUMMARY OF THE NEOPHOTIAN DISQUISITION

The Neophotian doctrine concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, as it is presented in Langen's pamphlet after the rhapsodies proposed at the sectarian Bonn conference, is reduced to the following sum.

In the Gospels and the writings of the Apostles, he says, the following points only are found. The Holy Spirit is the third hypostasis in the Godhead; He is the Spirit of the Father and the Spirit of the Son on account of the unity of essence with the Father and the Son, and therefore, just as He is sent by the Father, so also He is sent by the Son; He has His essence not from Himself, but from the Father, and He has from the Father the same essence, which, because of the consubstantiality between the Father and the Son, is also the essence of the Son (Matth. XXVIII. 19; Io. XIV. 16. 26; XV. 26; XVI.

7 sqq.; Act. V. 3. 9; XVI. 6; Rom. VIII. 9; 1. Cor. II. 10. 12; XII. 4 sqq.; 2. Cor. XIII. 13; Gal. IV. 6; Phil. I. 19; 1. Pet. I. 11.).

With regard to the Father it is expressly stated that He proceeds from the Father; with regard to the Son, however, in the books of the New Testament nothing else is said than that He is the Spirit of the Son, joined to Him by identity of essence. Even in Io. XVI. 14. 15., by that He shall receive of mine, it is said only that the essence of the Holy Spirit is derived from the essence of the Father, which is at the same time the essence of the Son (169).

Whether the Holy Spirit also has His essence from the Son, that is, whether He also proceeds from the Son, because the Son is consubstantial with the Father—"to this question, since nothing about it has been handed down immediately in the New Testament, one could only answer speculatively." Thus Langen, §§ 2, 3, 4.

But if the question concerning the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son could be solved speculatively, and in fact has been solved in the speculation of the whole Catholic Church, how, I ask, does this not suffice, especially for men who are wont with such confidence to parade their knowledge? For what else, in the present matter, can be understood by the name "speculation," except that it be shown that in those very heads of doctrine which are explicitly revealed about the

---

169 "It is merely said that the essence of the Holy Spirit is derived from the essence of the Father, which is at the same time that of the Son." — By the way, you will observe that this mode of speaking about a "derivation of essence" is not theological; for the essence of the Spirit is certainly not derived from the essence of the Father, but the one numerically identical essence of the Father and the Son is communicated to the Spirit. If something similar occurs among the Fathers, it is clear that essentia Patris etc. is taken for hypostasis; but this signification in Langen's statement is excluded by the other member, "which (the essence of the Father) is at the same time the essence of the Son." (Vide Tract. de Trinit. ed. 2, p. 159, nota.)

Holy Spirit and about the mutual relations of the divine Persons, there is contained the procession of the third Person equally from the second as from the first Person of the Most Holy Trinity? Now a doctrine which is contained implicitly in what is explicitly revealed, such that by simple analysis, or (to speak as the adversary) by speculation it can be deduced, is certainly itself objectively included in the deposit of revelation, which has been entrusted to the Church not only to be guarded but also to be expounded. Therefore, especially when errors arising bring the truth into peril, the Church—endowed with the divine charism of the teaching office through the assisting Spirit of truth—can and ought to explain it, and to propose it to all the faithful as already in itself and explicitly to be believed. (Vide Tractat. de divina Traditione Th. VIII. XXV.)

Moreover, since the deposit of revelation is contained not in Scripture alone but also in unwritten traditions to be received with equal reverence (Conc. Trid. sess. IV.), how, I ask, does it follow from the assertion that nothing is taught in the books of Scripture about the procession of the Spirit from the Son, that this is not a revealed truth—before it has been shown that in the unwritten traditions handed down, as it were, by hand, nothing is contained concerning the same origin of the Holy Spirit?

II. Yet for these new heretics, as for the earlier ones, in order to attain the aim of perverting individual dogmas, it is necessary first to disturb the very principles of Christian and Catholic cognition. Our Neoprotestant writer, therefore—since he cannot deny that the doctrine of the Eastern no less than of the Western Fathers concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son or through the Son is clear and universal—in order to reach, for the purpose of the new sect, the denial of the Catholic dogma, without demonstration and as though occupied with something else, assumes the following principles.

1º He distinguishes between the tradition of faith and theological speculation. Meanwhile he seems to concede truths of tradition; he denies that the doctrines of speculation pertain to dogmas that must be believed.

2º Whatever the Eastern and Western Fathers teach concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, whenever they do not expressly affirm that it is a dogma of the Catholic faith, he refers all these things to theological speculation. But lest the universality and perpetuity of the doctrine of the Fathers themselves, and the very symbols of faith, should convict this empty sophism of being such, the author in § 32 reserves for himself a new and even more absurd sophism—another distinction, namely, between "the unanimous tradition of faith" and "the theological tradition, likewise unanimous and even received in the very symbols of faith." Whence he is compelled to concede that the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, as the Father and the Son are one principle, is expressed in the theological tradition; but he denies that it pertains to the tradition of faith, and therefore he denies that it is a dogma to be believed.

3º He considers the doctrine only in that state in which it was before the controversy was stirred and before the rise of the opposing heresy; and he has absolutely no regard for the subsequent declarations and definitions by which, against the innovations of Photius, the doctrine was more distinctly explained and more expressly confirmed, §§ 5–32.

By adopting this method, without doubt all dogmas can be eliminated and all heresies defended, so that nothing firm and fixed remains any longer in the Christian faith. The doctrine, for example, concerning the Most Holy Trinity—if the Nicene definitions and the explanations of subsequent ages be set aside—will have to be considered with the Socinians only in the manner of preaching,

"when the Fathers had not yet asserted the solution of difficult questions, since no slanderer was pressing" (Aug. in Ps. 54. n. 22). And the things which, in that age when the Trinity had not yet been perfectly treated (Aug. ibid.), the Fathers taught concerning the unity and distinction of the divine Persons—all these will be referred to theological speculation; and since this, however unanimous and proceeding from the deposit of revelation, according to Langen's principles does not constitute a dogma, one will finally arrive at the elimination of the entire Catholic doctrine of the Most Holy Trinity from the catalogue of dogmas to be believed. The same clever calculation—though not without a slur upon learning—can be, and doubtless will be, instituted by Neoprotestants according to their own principles in all the mysteries of faith, so that soon nothing will remain in that sect apart from mere rationalism.

4º In the three Langenian principles that have been set forth there is already manifestly contained also that which we said to be the very form both of all Protestantism and of this new sect as well: namely, the denial of infallibility in guarding and expounding the deposit of faith, and consequently the denial of the indefectibility of the Church. Indeed, if what this man boldly asserts were true, the Church of Christ would have to be said to have long since perished in the world. For certainly the Church of Christ is not that communion which in its profession proposes and teaches heresy. Moreover, an error is heretical not only if what is false is taught as a revealed truth; but also if that which indeed is true, yet not revealed, is prescribed to be believed as revealed (cf. Tract. de Tradit. Th. IX. corollaria). Most certainly, therefore, the Church of Christ is not that communion which, as an article of revealed faith in its profession, proposes for belief a doctrine not revealed; or conversely, which condemns as heretical a doctrine by no means opposed to revelation—whether the doctrine thus proposed or thus condemned be true or false in itself.

Now the universal Catholic Church, through many centuries, has taught and teaches as an article of faith the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son; the schismatic Eastern Church has condemned and condemns this doctrine not only as by no means pertaining to the Catholic faith, but absolutely as heretical; whence the schismatics, chiefly on account of this article, distinguish their Church as "Orthodox" from the Western Church, which they call "heterodox" (170). But, in truth, from Langen's principles this doctrine is neither revealed—as the Catholic Church professes—nor is it heresy—as the schismatic communion condemns it; rather it must be held as theological speculation, neither to be believed by faith nor to be condemned. Therefore neither the Catholic Church nor the Eastern Church is the infallible guardian and interpreter of the deposit of faith; and hence neither can any longer be considered the Church of Jesus Christ, since to neither do

---

170 How many anathemas the Photius-fury hurled against the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son is sufficiently well known. In the encyclical letter of Photius to the Eastern bishops (l. I. ep. 13)—which thereafter served as a kind of armory for the entire theology of the schismatics for the assault upon the Catholic Church and the defense of their sect—the Catholic dogma is proscribed as pagan mythology to the contumely of the Trinity, as fable and stage-play contrived for the crime of Macedonius against the Holy Spirit, as a new impiety, the pinnacle of blasphemy against the Gospels, against the sacred synods, against the holy Fathers—in a word, against all the Prophets, Apostles, Pontiffs, Martyrs, and against the very words of the Lord; as an atheistic opinion, a blasphemy than which none greater can be, even by itself sufficient that its heralds be subjected to a thousand anathemas—who are the new forerunners of the apostasy, ministers of Antichrist (οἱ νέοι τῆς ἀποστάσεως πρόδρομοι, οἱ θεραπευταὶ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου, ex 2 Thess. II. 3. 4)—worthy of a thousand deaths, and so forth (Phot. l. c. nn. 8–23, 33. Vide supra p. 203).

the promises pertain: Behold I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world; that the Spirit of truth may abide with you forever; upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. I am well aware that Neoprotestants, together with the earlier sects, necessarily deny this supernatural infallibility and indefectibility of the Church of Jesus Christ in order to cover their own defection; but by this very fact they deny the truth of Christ's promises, the institution of the Church, and the entire work of redemption. Let them then prove themselves to be new Apostles; let them say that Christ has descended again, has taught again, has been crucified again, has died again, has risen again; "for thus He is wont to make Apostles" (Tertull. Praescript. c. 30). See the encyclical letters of the Supreme Pontiff Pius IX, «Inter gravissimas», 28 Octob. 1870, and «Etsi multa», 21 Novemb. 1873.

CHAPTER II.

LANGEN'S CONCEALMENT AND DISTORTION OF THE TESTIMONIES OF SCRIPTURE

Just as in philosophy, with those who call into question the very principles of natural cognition, so too in theology, with those who undermine the principles of Christian cognition, it is almost futile to treat of individual truths before they have been brought to acknowledge those very principles. Nonetheless, let us briefly examine Langen's errors concerning this specific Catholic truth of the procession of the Holy Spirit.

After citing the texts of the New Testament in which the Holy Spirit is treated, Langen lays down this conclusion as though it were clear of itself: with regard to the relation of the Spirit to the Son, nothing further is said in the New Testament except that he is the

Spirit of the Son, united with him by identity of essence ([171]). He provides no demonstration of this sense; for his entire "proof" is reduced to the simple observation that even in John 16:14–15 nothing else is expressed except the unity of essence in the Son and the Holy Spirit, inasmuch as the essence of the Spirit is derived from the essence of the Father, which is at the same time the essence of the Son (p. 5).

Yet in the books of the New Testament it is repeatedly declared that the Spirit has his essence communicated by the Son, no less than he has it from the Father, as the words, both taken in themselves and according to the constant Catholic understanding of the Fathers, bear a sense by no means ambiguous. This has been sufficiently demonstrated in Section III, chap. I of our Treatise on the Trinity.

1º It is certain that in the New Testament the proper name of the third Person, by which he is distinguished from the Father and the Son, is the name "Holy Spirit." But all the personal names—i.e., the names by which the Persons of the Most Holy Trinity are distinguished—necessarily express a real relation to another Person; for the divine Persons are distinguished among themselves solely by real relations, and there are no real relations among the divine Persons except relations of origin. Real distinction obtains only under this formal aspect: inasmuch as the Father is the Father of the Son, that is, the Father generating the Son by an eternal relation; and the Son is the Son of the Father, that is, begotten by an eternal relation, proceeding by generation from the Father; and the Spirit is the Spirit of another Person, that is, breathed by an eternal relation, proceeding by spiration from another Person.

---

[171] "The Spirit of the Son, united with him by the identity of essence."

These are not speculations of human ingenuity but truths entirely revealed in the Christian dogma of the unity of God and the distinction of the three Persons. For from the very fact that by faith and by reason it is established that God is one with the unity of singularity—what in more recent usage is called numerical unity—it is equally established that all the absolute perfections which we conceive to be in God, and which we distinguish by reason, are one without real distinction; hence the names by which absolute perfections are expressed cannot be understood as signifying real distinction, without thereby denying the unity of God. If, therefore, there are nonetheless in God several Persons really distinct—which is known only by revelation and believed by faith—this distinction is not by absolute perfections but solely by relations among the Persons; therefore the Persons in God are distinguished and constituted by relations of one to another, and (unlike what obtains in creatures) they are relative Persons. Accordingly, the proper names by which the Persons are signified, inasmuch as they are really distinct, express the relations of the Persons, or the Persons formally as relative. For whatever is said absolutely of one Person is entirely common and one and undivided for all the Persons; therefore the names which have been revealed as proper to one Person, and which distinguish that Person from the other Persons, contain the revelation of that Person's relation to another.

Thus, when it is said "God the Father" and "God the Son," we believe that one God is revealed with the unity of all absolute perfections, and yet such that the Father, under the formal relation to the Son, and the Son, under the formal relation to the Father, are two Persons really distinct. In precisely the same way, when "God the Holy Spirit" is revealed—who by the proper name "Spirit" is distinguished as a Person from the Father and the Son—it is revealed that the Holy Spirit is one God with the Father and the Son, without

any distinction in absolute perfections, and that he is a distinct Person under the formal relation of "Spirit" to another Person, of whom he is the Spirit. In other words: the personal names in the Most Holy Trinity signify, not something absolute, but something relative to another Person. Just as "Son" is not said with respect to himself, but relatively to another Person of whom he is begotten, so "Spirit" (personally) is not said with respect to himself, but relatively to another Person by whom he is spirated. Whoever would deny this relative signification of the names which distinguish the Persons would thereby deny that the divine Persons are distinguished solely by relations; and consequently, with the whole doctrine of the mystery of the Trinity thrown into confusion, he would fall into Arianism or Tritheism by asserting a distinction also by some absolute perfection, or into Sabellianism by denying that the distinction by divine relations is real. Therefore, just as the revealed name "Son," for the second Person of the Trinity, by its relative signification contains the revelation of this Person's origin from that One of whom he is said to be the Son, so too the revealed name "Holy Spirit," signifying the third Person relatively as having been spirated, contains the revelation of origin from that Person of whom he is the Spirit, that is, by whom he has been spirated.

Given this signification of the proper and personal name, there remains only to inquire of which Person—or to which Person—the Spirit is said relatively. For this is a point in which the names "Father" and "Son" not only signify an indeterminate relation of origin to another Person, but definitively signify the relation of the Father to the Son, and of the Son to the Father; whereas the hypostatic name "Spirit," although it signifies the relation of the spirated to the spirator, nevertheless does not of itself determine which Person is spirating; rather, this must be learned elsewhere from those divine testimonies in which that very Person is expressed of

whom the Holy Spirit is. Now in the books of the New Testament, by the explicit words of Christ and of the Apostles, the same One who is the Spirit of the Father is also declared to be the Spirit of the Son, as all know and as Langen himself freely admits. Therefore, just as by the very name "Son" in the Most Holy Trinity the origin of the second Person from the Father is revealed, so by this very appellation "the Spirit of the Father and of the Son" the Spirit is revealed as spirated and thus as having origin from the Father and from the Son.

With this relative signification—which necessarily follows from the unity of the absolute essence and the real distinction of the relative Persons—one has demonstrated (see Th. XXXII, n. II, De Trinitate, and against Macarius, Sect. I, c. 2, § 4) that the proper name of the third Person, "Spirit of the Father" and "Spirit of the Son," has always been understood in the Church of God by the ancient Fathers. There we produced the explicit doctrine—defended even polemically against heretics—of Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, Cyril, Maximus, Augustine, Leo the Great, Fulgentius, and the Fathers of the Council of Worms, to whom many others could easily be added in this common judgment: "God sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts ... we have learned from Holy Scripture the spiration by the Son of God, and we say that the Son is the fons Spiritus" ... "By these appellations (Father, Son, Holy Spirit) what is signified is the way they are referred to each other, not the substance by which they are one ... and the Spirit, inasmuch as he is referred to something, is of some spirator; and certainly one who spirates the Spirit is a spirator." "The Father is not for himself but for the Son; the Son is not for himself but for the Father; the Spirit is of someone who breathes [him]; therefore he is referred to the Father and the Son. These, then, are the relative names which make the Trinity; the essential [names] in no way are triplicated." Athanasius, Augustine, Fulgentius (see the places cited).

Now, I ask, let judgment be made of this contrivance by which our theologian deems himself permitted to elude all testimonies about the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son. "With regard to the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son," he says, "nothing more is said in the New Testament except that he is the Spirit of the Son, united with him by identity of essence." He ought rather to have said: in the New Testament the third Person of the Trinity, by a personal and therefore a relative name, is declared to be the Spirit not only of the Father but also of the Son; and therefore he is the spiramen (ἡ πνοή), as Athanasius and Cyril say, or (as the most ancient Latin version of Athanasius's work De Trinitate et de Spiritu Sancto has it) the spiratio of the Father and of the Son, and thus spirated by the Father and the Son.

2º Of the texts, John 16:14–15 alone, among those by which we have demonstrated that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son as from the Father (see De Trinitate, Th. XXXII, n. I), Langen judges worthy of some comment of his own, in order to deflect it to an alien sense almost in the same way the Photian party is wont to do; for in the remaining places (as we have already noted above) he deemed it not worth the effort either to attack the Catholic interpretation with arguments or to prove his own contrary one.

Langen's entire commentary on that passage (p. 5) runs thus: "The words also of John 16:14–15, de meo accipiet ('he will take of mine'), express nothing else than that the Holy Spirit, about to bring to perfection the work of the Son, will impart cognitions which are essentially proper to the Son himself, because the Son has all things that are proper to the Father, that is, the whole divine essence. If it had been said de me accipiet ('he will take from me'), the question of the essential origin of the Holy Spirit would already by that very text be defined. But the words de meo and omnia quaecumque habet Pater cannot be understood of personal relations, but only of the divine

essence. And so, even in this place it is said only that the essence of the Holy Spirit is derived from the essence of the Father, which is at the same time the essence of the Son."

A truly astonishing utterance for a professor of Catholic theology!

I call it astonishing because he admits and adopts most true principles, in which there is manifestly contained—and from which there ineluctably follows—that in the words of Christ the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son is directly enunciated; and yet from these he draws the utterly contradictory conclusion that in Christ's words nothing is contained about the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son.

Indeed, he admits that what Christ called "my own" (de meo accipiet) is the divine substance itself—which is, to be sure, altogether manifest from the reason the Lord subjoined: "All things whatsoever the Father has are mine; therefore I said that he will take of mine." Therefore, by Langen's own concession, John says: "The Holy Spirit takes of the substance of the Son."

Now, both from the very simplicity of God and from the lengthy disputations of the Fathers against the Arians and afterwards against the Nestorians, it is established that in contexts of this sort the "substance of the Father," the "substance of the Son," is understood as the substance inasmuch as it is identified with the Father, and inasmuch as it is identified with the Son; and hence that the complex term signifies the Person of the Father and of the Son themselves, in such wise, however, that at the same time the communication and unity of that very substance is signified. "Let no one be astounded, when he hears that the Son of God is of the substance of God; rather let him assent to the Fathers (of Nicaea), who, to clarify the very concept, wrote in a more express way and, as it were, in a parallel sense, in place of 'of God,' 'of the substance (of the Father).' For they

judged it the same to say that the Word is of God and to say that he is of the substance of God" (172). Athanasius, De decretis Nicaenae synodi, n. 22; cf. De Synodis, n. 36. Hence there is also the celebrated saying of Cyril against the Nestorians: that there is "one nature of the Word Incarnate"; namely (as he himself explains in Defensio Anathematismorum 2 against Theodoret), "the nature of the Word, that is, the hypostasis—which is the Word himself—has truly been united to human nature" (173) (see the Treatise on the Incarnation, Th. XXXV). Therefore, without any doubt, the Catholic interpretation is true and is evident from the very words of Christ, which Bessarion (Ep. ad Alexium Lascarim, c. 7; Hardouin, Concilia, vol. IX, pp. 1067–1068) set forth thus: "The Holy Spirit takes from the Son; for he says, de meo accipiet. But what he takes is his essence; for he himself is not one thing and his essence another—else he would be composite … Thus from these words the following argument arises: The Spirit takes of the things that are the Father's; but all things that are the Father's are mine; therefore the Spirit takes of mine. And since he himself and what is his are one and the same on account of supreme simplicity, by taking of what is his he will take of him. This is the very point we saw explained above (p. 53) in Didymus, translated by St Jerome: 'The Son is said to receive from the Father the very things by which he subsists; for the Son is not

---

172 Ἀλλὰ καὶ μᾶλλον ἀποδεχέσθω τοὺς πατέρας διακαθάραντας τὸν νοῦν, λευκότερον καὶ ὡς ἐκ παραλλήλου τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γράψαντας, τὸ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας· ταὐτὸν γὰρ ἡγήσαντο λέγειν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ λέγειν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τὸ θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν λόγον. — Athanasius, De decretis Nicaenae synodi, n. 22; cf. De Synodis, n. 36.

173 Ἡ τοῦ λόγου φύσις, ἤγουν ὑπόστασις, ὁ ἐστὶν αὐτὸς ὁ λόγος. — On Cyril's dictum "μία φύσις τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη," see Defensio anathematismorum 2 contra Theodoretum; cf. the Treatise on the Incarnation, Th. XXXV.

anything other than those things which are given to him by the Father; nor is the substance of the Holy Spirit anything other than that which is given to him by the Son.'"

The sense of Christ's words is therefore altogether manifest. "He will take of mine"—that is, of the divine substance—not only as it is the Father's, but also formally as it is mine. But this does not differ from the other expression "he will take from me," which Langen desires, except that de meo more expressly signifies the very communication of the substance from the Son to the Holy Spirit. For to "take of the things that are the Father's," and by equal reason to "take of the things that are the Son's," in the divine Persons (where there can be no communication or reception except of substance) signifies nothing other than to take from the Father, to take from the Son, the divine substance. Therefore, since Langen concedes that the question concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son would have to be regarded as settled if Christ had said: "The Spirit will take from me," he must acknowledge that it is even more fully settled by the very words of the Son of God: "He will take of mine," just as the Fathers of Nicaea reformulated what had earlier been proposed less distinctly, "the Son is of the Father," into the more distinct, "of the substance of the Father."

3º In the Catholic Church the words of Christ have always been understood and explained in this sense, namely, that de meo accipiet signifies altogether the same as a me accipiet, "he will take from me"—which no one can doubt in view of the unanimous interpretation of the Fathers, both Western and Eastern, some of whom we cited in Th. XXXII and XXXV De Trinitate, and above against Macarius, Sect. I, c. 2, § 3.

"Moreover," says the Son, "he will take of mine, just as I myself [take] of the Father's; thus the linkage of the Father in the Son and of the Son in the Paraclete produces three cohering [Persons],

who are three one, not one [Person]" (174). "From another [Person comes] another: from the Father the Son, and from the Son the Spirit ... Because he will take of mine ... Therefore the Spirit takes from Christ, and Christ himself from the Father, and accordingly the Spirit also from the Father" (175).

"That which the Holy Spirit will take—whether it be power, or virtue, or doctrine—the Son said must be taken from himself, and again he signifies that this very [thing] must be taken from the Father ... Nor does it differ from whom it is taken (i.e., it is not taken in a different way but in the same way), since what is given by the Father is ascribed as given by the Son" (176). "The Son received all things from the Father ... And what he himself received, by the unity of nature, the Spirit also received from him, by that same unity, just as the Lord Jesus himself declares of his Spirit, saying: propterea dixi, de meo accipiet" (177). " 'All things that the Father has are mine; therefore I said, he will take of mine': thus he certainly intends to be understood as [saying] that I take from the Father; but therefore [he says of mine] because all the things that the Father has are his. This is not a commendation of diversity of nature, but of one principle" (178). " 'He will take of mine,' because what the Spirit received—the Father giving —the Son gives" (179). "Therefore he received of the Son, and 'all that the Father has are the Son's'; these the Holy Spirit received, because he proceeds not from the Father alone nor from the Son alone, but

---

174 Tertullian, Adversus Praxean, c. 25.

175 Marius Victorinus, Contra Arianos, l. I, in Bibliotheca Maxima, vol. IV, p. 257.

176 Hilary, De Trinitate VIII, n. 20.

177 Ambrose, De Spiritu Sancto II, n. 134; cf. In Lucam VIII, n. 66.

178 Augustine, Contra sermonem Arianorum, n. 19.

179 Leo Magnus, In Pentecosten, serm. 2, c. 5.

from both together" (180). Nay more, in the solemn profession of faith which the Roman Pontiffs, from at least the seventh century—two hundred years before the Photian controversy arose—were wont to issue, they attested this very point: "The Holy Spirit is confirmed to proceed from the Father; the same the Son of God declares that he receives of his own ... and by breathing upon the disciples ('Receive the Holy Spirit') he announces him as proceeding from himself" (181) (see above, p. 204).

"The Spirit receives from the Son (ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ); for, he says, 'he will take of mine'" (182). "The Spirit received from the Word (παρὰ τοῦ λόγου λαμβάνει), and whatever the Spirit has, he has from the Word" (183). "The Father indeed gives to the Son, and the Son communicates to the Holy Spirit; for it is Jesus himself, not I, who says ... 'because he takes of mine' " (184). " 'He will glorify me, because he will take of mine' ... The Holy Spirit's taking from the Son that which pertains to his nature must be recognized (or, understood) ... nor is the substance of the Holy Spirit other than that which is given to him by the Son" (185). " 'From me the Spirit proceeds' (παρ' ἐμοῦ ὁρμᾶται); but when I say 'from me,' I also signify 'from the Father,' for the things that are the Father's are mine; understand in this way that 'he will take of mine' " (186). "Christ is believed [to be] God from

---

180 Fulgentius, Fragmentum 27.

181 Liber diurnus Romanorum Pontificum, Migne, vol. CV, p. 47.

182 Athanasius, Ad Serapionem, ep. 1, n. 20; Contra Arianos, or. 3, n. 24.

183 Cyril of Jerusalem, Catecheses 16, n. 24. (Correcting the OCR in the Greek cited in-text: καὶ ὁ πατὴρ μὲν δίδωσιν υἱῷ, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς μεταδίδωσιν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι ... ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαμβάνει.)

184 Didymus (translated by St Jerome), De Spiritu Sancto, n. 37.

185 Apollinarius (in the Catena of Corderius, p. 396).

186 Epiphanius, Ancoratus, nn. 67, 72, 73.

God, from the Father; and the Spirit [is] from Christ or from both (καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἢ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων), as Christ himself testifies: 'who proceeds from the Father' and: 'he will take of mine.' Of the Spirit the Lord thus speaks: 'When the Paraclete comes, whom I will send to you, the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father' ... Again: 'He will glorify me, for he will take of mine.' If therefore he proceeds from the Father, [yet] he also, says the Lord, 'will take of mine.' For just as no one knows the Father except the Son, nor the Son except the Father, so I dare to say, neither does anyone know the Spirit except the Father and the Son, from whom he proceeds and from whom he receives (παρ' οὗ ἐκπορεύεται καὶ παρ' οὗ λαμβάνει); nor do the Son and the Father [anyone knows] except the Holy Spirit ... who is from the Father and from the Son (ὁ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ)" (187). "Altogether beyond reproach and beyond all calumny is the statement that his own Spirit is said to take something from the Only-Begotten; for proceeding naturally through him, as his proper Spirit, along with all the things he possesses perfectly, he is said to take the things that are his" (188). " 'He will take of mine, and he will declare it to you': for the Holy Spirit has been made witness of the divinity of the Only-Begotten, since he is of his

187 Cyril of Alexandria, In Ioannem, p. 930. (Correcting the OCR in the Greek cited in-text: ἀκαταγόρητον ἄρα παντελῶς, καὶ λοιδορίας ἀπάσης ἔξω κείσεται, τὸ λαβεῖν λέγεσθαί τι παρὰ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ· προϊὸν γὰρ δι' αὐτοῦ φυσικῶς, ὡς ἴδιον αὐτοῦ, μετὰ πάντων ὧν ἔχει τελείως, λαμβάνειν λέγεται τὰ αὐτοῦ.)

188 Theodorus of Heraclea (in the Catena; the Greek words are reported by Maldonatus on John 16, n. 47): τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα μάρτυς γέγονε τῆς τοῦ μονογενοῦς θεότητος, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ ὂν καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ ἐξαγγέλλων.

substance and announces his substance" (189). "Our Savior Jesus says of his consubstantial Paraclete that, while he proceeds indeed from the Father, he nevertheless receives from the Son, who makes his own and possesses all the things of the Father ... He proceeds from the Father, but receives from the Son all the things of the Son, who possesses all the Father's, in order to show that the substance of the one who receives, and of the one from whom he receives, and of the one from whom he naturally proceeds, is one and the same ... They are of the same substance with him from whom he proceeded, and from whom he receives" (190). "The Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten, the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and receiving from the Son" (191).

After these things, I think Langen will not dare to appeal to Maldonatus's interpretation of this passage. For in it, if one considers apart his explanation of the clause de meo accipiet, many statements are manifestly false and mutually contradictory, long since refuted by Petavius (De Trinitate, III, c. 8, nn. 7 sqq.). But if one attends to

---

189 Anastasius of Antioch, Oratio de Trinitate, nn. 12–13 (Gallandi, Bibliotheca, vol. XII, pp. 238–239).

190 Jacob of Serugh (5th century), in Assemani, Bibliotheca Orientalis, vol. I, p. 302. — Assemani notes that, according to the "common theology of the Orientals," the personal character of the Holy Spirit is expressed by the words of the Gospel, "a Patre procedens, a Filio accipiens" (ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܡܢܟ ، ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܡܢ), and elsewhere—especially in the liturgies—with the added phrase "accipiens a Filio essentialiter" (ܡܢ ܒܪܐ ܡܢ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܝܬܝ); just as among the Greek Fathers the Spirit is said to shine forth from the Son or to gush forth or to proceed naturally (φυσικῶς), according to nature (κατὰ φύσιν), essentially (οὐσιωδῶς), from the essence of the Son (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ υἱοῦ) (see De Trinitate, Th. XXXIII, n. II).

191 See De Trinitate, Th. XXXII.

Maldonatus's final conclusion, this coincides at last with the common interpretation: "Nor do I deny," he says, "that from this passage it is gathered that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son—nay rather, I affirm it. For, as we taught above, no Person is said to be sent or to receive anything from another unless he proceeds from that one ... Therefore, since in this place the Spirit is said to receive from the Son, from the Son indeed he proceeds" (Maldonatus, In Ioannem, XVI, n. 46; cf. n. 48).

No one will now ask what value there is in Langen's appended proof: "The words de meo and omnia quaecumque habet Pater cannot be understood of personal relations, but only of the divine essence." But what stupefaction of mind is this? By an entirely similar argument a Sabellian or an Arian would say that, in the Council of Nicaea, when the phrase "of the substance of the Father" was used, personal relation was not signified, but merely essence. Assuredly, it has never come into anyone's mind that, by these expressions—when the Son of God calls mine or my own the "all things that the Father has"—a relation to the Holy Spirit is signified; rather, what is expressed is nothing other than the divine essence, either equivalently and identically (21), or (since Langen concedes this) formally; yet it is signified under a twofold mode of subsisting (as we said a little above), namely, inasmuch as it is the Father's ("all things that the Father has") and inasmuch as it is the Son's ("what is mine," "the things that are mine"). Moreover, the relation to the third Person is expressed by the predicate added: "he will take of mine." This "taking," in a divine Person—the Holy Spirit—evidently signifies a relation; for a divine Person (for whom there is but one divine nature) cannot receive anything from another Person except what is communicated by origin from that other Person. "But," Langen will say, "that other Person is not expressed here." On the contrary: because Christ did not only say "he will take what is mine," but much

more clearly, "he will take of mine," there is expressed both the term distinct from the Holy Spirit, from whom he will take—namely, a Person—and that which he takes, one and the same in the Person communicating and in the Person receiving—namely, the essence. Just as the Son is begotten by receiving of the essence of the Father (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός), so the Spirit takes of the essence of the Son (ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ)—not, to be sure, of the essence of the Son alone, but of the essence of the Father and of the Son: "All things whatsoever the Father has are mine; therefore I said that he will take of mine." In this very point is constituted the necessary order of the Persons of the Most Holy Trinity, as we have often already seen declared by the Fathers: "The Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father into the Son and from the Son proceed to sanctify the creature; rather, he proceeds at once from both, although the Father has given this to the Son, that as he proceeds from himself, so he should also proceed from that one. For we cannot say that the Holy Spirit is not life, since the Father is life and the Son is life; and hence, just as the Father, because he has life in himself, gave also to the Son to have life in himself, so he gave to him that life proceed from him, just as it proceeds also from himself" (Augustine, In Ioannem, Tract. 99, n. 9; see Th. XXIII, n. I).

CHAPTER III.

THE NEOPHOTIAN PERVERSION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE FATHERS

§. I.

Denial of the Catholic Principle of Tradition

After, in the manner we have seen, asserting at will—without even a semblance of proof—the claim that the "Professor of Catholic Theology" affirms that nothing is contained in Scripture itself

concerning the internal relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son, he proceeds to his historical account of how, in the course of the ages, there fared the exposition of the doctrine which the Catholic Church, at least for many centuries now, expressly professes and proclaims as an article of revealed faith in her creeds of faith, in the solemn definitions of Councils, and in the universal consensus (from which not even the Protestant sects themselves dared to depart so long as they retained the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity). In this "history of the doctrine's exposition" the man conducts himself in such a way as utterly to overturn the very principle of Catholic Tradition and its foundation—namely, the infallibility of the Church under the assistance of the Spirit of truth, promised forever (Io. XIV. 16; Matth. XXVIII. 20), for the integral guarding and truthful explication of the deposit of revelation. This denial of the Church's infallibility runs like Ariadne's thread through the entire little work of the Professor in such wise that this fundamental heresy is not only applied to τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ, that is, to the very subject-matter of the disputation and the thing he undertook to prove, but is presupposed in nearly every single argument.

He himself cannot deny that, from at least the time of Photius—when a more distinct statement and polemical defense of the doctrine became necessary—there has been the public and solemn consent and profession of the whole Catholic Church concerning the article of revealed faith on the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, as we said, in the symbols, in the definitions of Councils, and in the universal preaching and faith. Yet this profession and faith of the whole Catholic Church for at least a thousand years, and these same definitions of faith, the Professor of Catholic Theology does not acknowledge as a sufficient proposal of faith to be believed, nor therefore as a sufficient demonstration of revealed doctrine, from which there must necessarily be inferred by way of the

argument from prescription the consenting doctrine and the explicit —or at least implicit—faith of all preceding ages back to the Apostles. And this is precisely an open denial of the Catholic principle concerning formal Tradition and the infallibility of the Church in the guardianship and explication of the whole of revealed doctrine, and the assertion of the principle of Protestantism, according to which there is no proposition of doctrine that is by the Church authentic and, by reason of the promised charism of the Holy Spirit, infallible; rather, to individual "doctors," and consequently to individual Christians, there belongs the right and duty of examining the very profession and faith of the Church and of judging whether and to what extent it is true and handed down from the Apostles, and of believing only on the basis of this private demonstration of each person—inasmuch as the Church's proposal has no supernatural and Christ-promised infallible authority but at most a merely human and historical authority. Then, by a second step, on the strength of parity of reasoning, there must likewise be examined and judged in the same way by individuals the doctrine of the Apostles, of Christ Himself, and of the whole of Scripture; and finally one must arrive at the denial of all dogmas at pleasure—a road upon which those "drowsy Catholics," at an even swifter pace than was once taken by the Protestants, have already advanced very far according to what they say, perhaps even farther according to what they think (192).

---

192 The one who not only, together with Langen, inscribes himself as a Professor, but outright as a Catholic Bishop—Hubert Reinkens—in the pastoral letter issued on 11 August 1873, invites all those who reproach the Old Catholics for not going far enough to come over themselves to the sect and to offer themselves as leaders for further advance—of course meanwhile retaining that vulgar phrase common to all the sects, ad progrediendum quousque deducet spiritus Iesu.

Since these things are so—now that the Catholic principle of Tradition has been repudiated—it seems to these neo-heretics of no great moment nor worth the effort to inquire into the Church's doctrine in the preceding ages. For whatever consensus among the Fathers from the second to the ninth century may be discovered, it can be no more infallible nor of greater supernatural authority than the unanimous profession and preaching of the Catholic Church through the subsequent thousand years. Since the Professor of Catholic Theology judges that this is to be despised, he will likewise regard that earlier consensus, whatever it may have been, as human doctrine in no way infallible, but as something to be examined and judged by each individual—whether, and to what extent, it accords with apostolic doctrine. But where, finally, is this norm of apostolic doctrine to be found? With the infallible magisterium denied, it is reduced—as among the early Protestants—to Scripture alone, according to which all dogmas and all teachers must be assessed and judged. Since, moreover, the norm of what is to be believed cannot be Scripture to be explained, but Scripture as explained; and since the explanation of Scripture is referred back to the temperament and wit of individuals; the consequence is that each person is to himself the sole norm of believing and denying, and the latter will have a much wider scope—and finally, as among the more recent Protestants, there will be constituted a rationalism extended to all dogmas of the supernatural order. (Vide Tract. de Tradit. edit. 2. Prolegomenon et Th. VI; XX. n. 3.) But does not Dr. Langen admit some authority in the testimony and doctrine of the Church up to the ninth century? So, indeed, it might appear to a cursory reader; yet what sort of authority this is he nowhere declares in his own words; moreover, from his manner of handling the testimonies of the ancient Fathers it appears that, however much they agree, he recognizes in them nothing other than the private opinions of individual doctors—so

that, with regard to this article of faith at least, which for a thousand years now has been defined and believed as Catholic faith, and by parity of reasoning with regard to other articles, there may remain the liberty, at one's pleasure, of believing, opining, denying—so as to be drained off into a new cesspool from the confluence of the dregs of various Eastern and Western sects. For this is the absurd and intrinsically self-contradictory aim of the whole enterprise, as once it was of the apostate Marcantonio de Dominis and, more recently, of many sectarians. Let us now examine the "history of the dogma" as it is set forth by Langen.

§. II.
The Distinction Introduced by Langen Between Procession from the Son and Through the Son.

First of all there must be removed the Neophotian error by which the whole mystery of unity and distinction in the divine Persons is perverted. The two formulas—"The Spirit is, or proceeds, from the Father and the Son," and "The Spirit is, or proceeds, from the Father through the Son"—Langen everywhere (cf. p. 23, 26, 27, 37, 39, 40, 64, 101, 118, 120, 122, 125) compares with one another and sets in opposition to each other, as though there were a real difference between the two, such that the latter might be admissible in the sense of the orthodox Fathers—especially the Eastern—and at the same time the former could be denied; indeed, he claims that the

former was denied by the Eastern Fathers (193), in the sense of the Western Fathers, whose proper author (p. 63, 112) he makes out to be Augustine. He explains, moreover, the Eastern formula "through the Son" in such a way that there is signified only "some participation" of the Son in the procession of the Holy Spirit—consisting in this, that the Spirit, proceeding from the Father, "passes through the Son" (194), and that the Father's relation to the Holy Spirit is one thing and the Son's relation another. What sort of "passing" this may be no mind, human or angelic, conceives; certainly among none of the holy Fathers is there any mention of it—unless it be that Augustine explodes a similar figment as a manifest error. The Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father "into" the Son, and from the Son proceed to sanctify the creature; rather He proceeds simultaneously from both, although the Father has given this to the Son, that just as He proceeds from Himself, so too He proceeds from the Son—Aug. in Io. Tract. 99, n. 9; contr. sermon. Arian. n. 19. If the Son is not, with the Father, one principle—or, as the Greeks say, one cause—of the procession of the third Person, then any other "participation" of

---

193 Something not unlike this Langenian error Neander—a man, from Jew to Protestant Pietist, than whom scarcely anyone has written a more treacherous "history" so as to pervert the truths of the Catholic faith—had already said in his Historia ecclesiastica (T. IV, p. 111 sq., ed. 4). Whence it is indeed a matter for astonishment—and of regret—when we see these books of Neander being recommended even by certain Catholic men, not without great praise and with the greatest peril for beginners.

194 "Der Sohn wird nicht von jeder Betheiligung an seinem Ausgange oder Ursprung ausgeschlossen. Eine Betheiligung an dem immanenten Ausgange des h. Geistes. Das Ausgehen des h. Geistes als ein Durchgehen durch den Sohn. Das immanente Durchgehen des h. Geistes durch den Sohn. Vom Vater ausgehend in den Sohn." p. 26, 27, 34, 72, 101, 118.

the Son in the immanent procession divides the Persons, and thereby perverts the dogma of consubstantiality. To ascribe such a heresy to the Fathers in those very places where, in speaking of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father through the Son, they are for the most part speaking in order to defend consubstantiality against the Arians, is assuredly absurd.

Note: From that formula, qui a Patre procedit, employed in the Council of Constantinople, "it can be concluded" (says our author, p. 61) that the Council wished to designate the relation of the Father to the Holy Spirit "as a relation of its own," and therefore that the Son is to be understood as altogether in another relation to the same Holy Spirit (jedenfalls in einem andern Verhältnisse zu ihm). If the Father's relation and the Son's relation to the Holy Spirit are different, since this is a relation of origin, that is, spiration, there will therefore be two spirationes (one and another), and by this very fact two principles. "Diffinimus... quod Spiritus Sanctus ex utroque aeternaliter tamquam ab uno principio et unica spiratione procedit... Sacro approbante Concilio, damnamus et reprobamus omnes, qui negare praesumpserint Spiritum Sanctum ex Patre et Filio procedere; sive etiam temerario ausu asserere, quod Spiritus Sanctus ex Patre et Filio tamquam ex duobus principiis, et non tamquam ex uno procedat." Conc. Florent. et Lugdun. II. (Hard. IX, p. 422; VII, 705.) Moreover, if the Council—and therefore Scripture, whose words are the same—by this clause qui a Patre procedit indicates an "other" relation of the Father than of the Son, then there will likewise have to be understood an "other and other" operation in the distinct Persons whenever the faith is proclaimed in "God the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth," and, in general, whenever anything is asserted of the Father without the other Persons being explicitly named at the same time. But the exact opposite is true: for the procession "from the Father" includes the procession "from the Son,"

and every operation of the Father [includes] the operation of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, because the three divine Persons are one in all things where the opposition of relation does not intervene—that is, because the Persons are really distinguished among themselves only by the relations of origin of one from Another. Therefore by the explicit profession of procession from the Father there is not expressed "a different and different" relation of the Father and of the Son, but necessarily one and the same; no otherwise than the one divinity of the three Persons is expressed when "the Father is God" is predicated.

The particles ex and per, when transferred to the distinct divine Persons in Scripture, stand firm and have a determinate causal signification: in such wise that unity is indeed preserved with respect to the notion of cause in the Persons from whom (ex qua) and through whom (per quam) the terminus is produced, and at the same time there is expressed that distinction of the Persons whereby the productive power, numerically one, is communicated by the one Person "from whom," to the other "through whom," the production is said to be. "One God, from whom are all things, and through whom are all things" (Rom. XI. 36): namely, all things are from the Father, through the Son. From this manner of speaking the Arians, indeed, inferred subordination and—(as Langen says)—"some participation" of the Son to the Father; but against this heresy the Fathers—by name the Greeks Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Cyril—constantly defended the dogma of the unity of the cause, and at the same time of that distinction of the Persons which we have mentioned, expressed by those very particles. See Tract. de Trin. Th. XXXVI; cf. Th. XIII, n. II. Since these things are so, assuredly the Greek Fathers, even when speaking of the internal relations of the Persons, in that formula in which they say that the Holy Spirit is, shines forth, or proceeds from the Father through the Son, intended to express nothing other than the unity of the principle together with the distinction of the Persons

—namely, that the spiring power and the spiratio are in the Father as in an original and incommunicated source, and are communicated, numerically the same, by the Father to the Son. But this very thing is contained in the other formula of the procession from the Father and the Son; although in the latter the unity of the principle is more directly stated, whereas in the former the distinction and order of the Persons is more directly declared, as was demonstrated in the same Thesis XXXVI.

Assuredly, in the fabricated diversity of the two formulas there are contained errors regarding the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity which are not the Fathers' but Langen's own, since he has not understood the distinction and unity of the divine Persons. Let us hear the Professor's statement about this supposed difference. "The Greek Fathers," he says, "by common doctrine attributed spiration to the Father, by no means to the Father and the Son—even those who taught that 'the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son,' or that He is 'from the Father and the Son,' or that He 'receives from the Son,' and that He 'has His essence from the Father through the Son.' But in the West there was introduced by Augustine a discrepant mode of doctrine (der abweichende Lehrtropus), [namely,] that the Holy Spirit is the personal communion between the Father and the Son. In this mode of conceiving, it was understood of itself that the Spirit proceeds, just as from the Father, so also from the Son. Whence there followed, as it were, a bilateral spiration; but the unity of God was saved by adding that the Son has it from the Father that He should spirate the Holy Spirit—that the spiration is effected by one common act of the Father and the Son" (Langen, p. 104–105; cf. 118).

If these things are true—if, I say, the Greek Fathers do not attribute spiration to the Son and yet concede "some participation" of the Son in the procession of the Holy Spirit, as Langen supposes—then there will be one act in the Father and another in the Son: there

spiration, here not spiration but participation. Moreover, in the same manner Scripture and the Fathers speak of the works ad extra: that all created things are from the Father through the Son and through the Holy Spirit, or in the Holy Spirit. Whence it clearly follows that ad intra, by distinct acts of the Father and the Son, there would be two principles; similarly ad extra, by the number of Persons, there would be three distinct acts of creation and of every operation—as Günther taught—and therefore three principles. All and each of these things signify a distinction (at least numerical) of natures in God, just as there is a distinction of Persons. Finally, what Langen says about the discrepant doctrine of the Westerners involves a contradiction. For if there is "one common act of spiration in the Father and the Son," the spiration is not "bilateral," just as creation is not "trilateral"; but if the spiration is said to be bilateral, then for that very reason it is not one undivided act; rather, as is imputed to the Greek Fathers, there will be two distinct acts and two principles—the sole difference being that by the Easterners there would have been asserted, after the Arian manner, a subordination of the principles, but by the Westerners a coordination of the same, in a tritheistic error.

No less absurd are Langen's reasonings by which he tries to find that difference—of which there is not only no trace among the Fathers, but manifestly doctrine to the contrary. By way of example, let one read what he writes about St. Ambrose. He claims that this

holy doctor was the first (de Spir. Sanct. l. I, n. 120) expressly to name the procession "from the Father and the Son" (195).

But, according to Langen, Ambrose did not understand the procession "from the Father and the Son" in the sense in which the Catholic Church now professes it; rather, in another sense in which the Greek Fathers taught the procession "from the Father through the Son"—a formula which, unlike the former, does not signify one and the same relation of the Father and the Son to the Holy Spirit, but one relation of the Father, another of the Son. Listen to his proof for this discrepant sense in Ambrose. "'To receive from the Son' (ex Io. XVI. 14)," says Langen, "for Ambrose (in Luc. l. VIII, n. 66) means the same as 'to have the essence from another (from the Son)'; for he teaches in express words that the Holy Spirit has His essence from the Son, just as the Son has [His] from the Father. Therefore the formula of procession 'from the Father and the Son' in Ambrose means procession 'from the Father through the Son.' That he did not at all admit the very same relation between the Holy Spirit and the Son as between the Holy Spirit and the Father is also apparent from another place (de Spir. S. l. I, n. 44), where more generally he says: 'If you name the Spirit, you have named both God the Father, from whom the Spirit proceeds, and the Son, because He is the Spirit also of the Son'" (Langen, p. 47–48).

---

195 The question is not about the words, but about the reality signified by the words; and the reality of procession "from the Father and the Son" was declared by Christ and the Apostles, and from them by the Church through her doctors, long before Ambrose. How carefully attention should be paid not so much to the words materially taken as to the sense appears from this very passage of Ambrose which Langen cites; for from the context (n. 119–120) processio there immediately signifies mission in time, which certainly (as we have shown elsewhere) includes as its foundation the internal and eternal procession.

From Langen's argument the contrary is clearly concluded—namely, that Ambrose absolutely teaches the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son just as from the Father. For the Spirit, according to Ambrose, receives His essence from the Son—which is itself the definition of the eternal procession. And since the Son does not have His essence, and therefore also His spiring power, as incommunicated but as communicated from the Father, the Spirit proceeds by one and the same spiration from the Father and the Son. Therefore one and the same relation of the Holy Spirit is expressed whether one says "procession from the Father and the Son" or "from the Father through the Son"; just as one creation is signified whether one says that "all things are created by the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit," or "by the Father through the Son and the Holy Spirit." The reason is that the particle "through the Son" no less than the other, "from the Son," is αἰτιακή, expressing a principle—the sole difference being that in the words "through the Son" the preposition through marks the communication of essence and likewise of the spiring power from the Father to the Son, as the Fathers cited by us in their proper place explain; a communication which brings about no difference of essence, of power, or of the relation of principle, but (since it is nothing other than generation) constitutes the distinction of the Persons under the formal ratio of Father and Son.

The same considerations hold for the one relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and to the Son in the other passage which Langen adduces (from l. I de Spiritu Sancto). Ambrose's doctrine is that which often occurs among other Fathers—by name Basil and Gregory Nazianzen—namely, that the names of the divine Persons are each of them relative, and therefore signify the Persons themselves in relation to others; for this reason a single Person cannot rightly be understood and named without the other Persons' being conceived at the same time as correlatives. "He who in the Trinity names the

Spirit," says Ambrose, "names the Spirit in relation to another, of whom He is the Spirit, that is, the spirated; but He is, as Scripture teaches, not only the Spirit of the Father—as the words signify, 'who proceeds from the Father'—but in the same way the Spirit of the Son, as He is so called in Scripture itself." Therefore, he who names the Spirit in the Trinity simultaneously includes the correlative both of the Father and of the Son, of each of whom He is relatively the Spirit, that is, the spirated; for there is no other real relation among the divine Persons, nor can one be conceived, other than the relation of origin. But this one origin itself is expressed by all those ways of speaking of the Fathers derived from Scripture—whether they say that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, or from the Father through the Son, or that He is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, or that He is referred through the Son to the Father.

Ambrose explains the whole matter more clearly still in those same books De Spiritu Sancto. "The Son received all things from the Father" (proved from Matth. XI. 27; Io. XVI. 15). "And what He Himself received through the unity of nature, from Him the Spirit also received through the same unity"—as the Lord Jesus Himself declares, speaking of His Spirit: "for this reason I said, He will receive of Mine and will declare it to you." Therefore what the Spirit speaks (for "He will not speak from Himself") is the Son's (communicated by the Son); what the Son gave is the Father's (communicated by the Father): thus neither the Son nor the Spirit speaks anything "from Himself" (but the Son from the Father alone, the Spirit from the Father and the Son), because the Trinity utters nothing "outside itself" (i.e., because all three Persons speak with one and the same utterance, just as they are one essence; and that essence and utterance is in the Father uncommunicated, and therefore the Father speaks "from Himself"; it is in the Son from the Father, in the Spirit from the Father and the Son, that is, from the Father through the Son,

communicated: therefore neither the Son nor the Spirit speaks "from Himself"). Ambros. De Spir. S. l. II, n. 134 (cf. what we set forth above, p. 228). Thus both the doctrine and the argumentation are in error by which these men, in order to obscure somehow the unanimous consent of the Fathers, strive to fabricate a real difference between the doctrine of procession "from the Father and the Son" and that "from the Father through the Son," in opposition to the explicit definition and at the same time explanation of the Ecumenical Council of Florence. "With the approval of this holy universal Council, we define that this truth of faith must be believed and received by all Christians, and thus that all profess that the Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son eternally... and that He proceeds eternally from both as from one principle and one spiration; declaring that what the holy doctors and Fathers say, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, tends to this understanding, that by this there may be signified that the Son also is —according to the Greeks indeed a cause (αἰτία), according to the Latins a principle—of the subsistence of the Holy Spirit, just as the Father. And since all things that are the Father's the Father Himself, by begetting His only-begotten, gave to Him except to be the Father, this very thing, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, the Son Himself has eternally from the Father, from whom He also was eternally begotten" (Hard. IX, p. 422, 986).

With this error excluded, since Langen—not without contradiction—at length himself admits (p. 126) that "there is no essential difference among the Fathers" between the preaching of procession whether "from the Father and the Son" or "from the Father through the Son," let us now see what doctrine he for his part discovered to have been proposed and preached in the universal Church, before the Photian schism, so as to eliminate, for his purpose, the article of faith.

§. III.

Langen's Admission Regarding the Consensus of the Fathers on the Doctrine of the Procession Through the Son or from the Son

He adduces, from the second to the ninth century, the doctors and Fathers of the Church—Tertullian, Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra, Hilary, Marius Victorinus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, Epiphanius, Didymus (196), Ambrose, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, the First Council of Toledo, Augustine, Paulinus of Nola, Leo the Great, the Second Council of Toledo, the Athanasian Creed, Vigilius of Thapsus, Gennadius, Cyril of Alexandria, Gelasius of Cyzicus, Anastasius of Antioch, Pope Hormisdas, Fulgentius, the Third Council of Toledo, Gregory the Great, the Council of Hatfield, Maximus, John of Damascus, Tarasius at the Seventh Council, Charlemagne, the Council of Friuli, Pope Hadrian I, Leo III, the Council of Aachen.

He confesses—and by citing their words shows—that all these held and taught, with full agreement, the eternal, immanent procession, or the reception of the essence, or the subsistence of the Holy Spirit from the Father through the Son, or from the Father and the Son. In both the earlier and the later way of expressing the dogma (cf. pp. 125–126), the primordial principle in the Father was understood and defended, namely, that the Son has [this] not from himself but from the Father as the original fount, so that he too is an active origin of the Holy Spirit. It was solely this prerogative of the

---

196 Langen (p. 44) calls Didymus "saint," perhaps because he found him numbered among the heretics (certainly not on account of his doctrine concerning the Most Holy Trinity—in which, as Jerome testifies, cont. Ruffin. II, n. 16, "certe catholicus est"—but on account of the errors of the Origenists).

original fount in the Father that both the other doctors in general and, by name, Maximus and John of Damascus wished to keep safe and intact when they wished the Holy Spirit to be said to proceed "through the Son," yet not "from the Son," and "from the Father," yet not "from the Son" as from a cause.

Moreover, Langen admits that the Fathers of the Second Ecumenical Council (at Constantinople) without doubt held the common opinion of a procession from the Father through the Son; but, given the purpose of the Council—namely, the defense of the divinity of the Holy Spirit and of the procession from the Father, denied by the Macedonians—an explicit mention of the Son was not necessary (p. 61). He says that Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret by no means called into question the relation of origin of the Holy Spirit to the Son; they only denied, against the Pneumatomachi, a creation of the Spirit by the Son or through the Son (pp. 92ff.). Rusticus the deacon was by no means in doubt that the Son in some manner has a relation to the procession of the Holy Spirit; but, because of the diverse form of speaking among the Fathers —since some had said that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, while others had said from the Father and the Son —this question as to the equal mode of the procession seemed to him not yet resolved and demonstrated (p. 105). From this inquiry of Rusticus (concerning which we spoke in Tractate Th. XXXVIII), and from the words of Pelagius I in his exposition of faith to Childebert, king of the Franks—"who (the Spirit), proceeding timelessly from the Father, is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son"—Langen thinks one must observe that at Rome at that time (the sixth century) the article Filioque had not yet been considered a matter settled.

These are all the documents, relevant to the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit, which our disputant has produced from writings prior to the Photian controversy. Now, however, the manner

is still to be considered in which the Fathers set forth the doctrine. The very internal rationale of the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity admits no proposition concerning the origin of the divine Persons, and thus concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, other than one derived from divine revelation, in which it is contained either explicitly or implicitly. The question, therefore, cannot be whether the Fathers set forth the doctrine as derived from the sources of revelation; this is most certain. The only question is whether one or another individual proposed merely a private opinion about the inclusion of the doctrine in the word of God, or whether there is exhibited the consensus of the Catholic Church in the doctrine itself. This latter, in turn, can occur in three ways: either such that the dogma itself is taught simply, presupposing from the nature of the case its derivation from revealed truth; or such that there is an explicit appeal to the very source of the dogma in the monuments of revelation; or, finally, such that the article of faith, to be explicitly believed, is more urgently preached by an authentic definition, by public symbols, or by an explicit explanation of the obligation of faith, as to a truth already sufficiently proposed in the Church of God as revealed. This third mode of preaching, however, as anyone easily understands, more fittingly corresponds to that stage in which the truth must be defended against mounting errors; and therefore it would be no wonder if it occurred more rarely in the earlier stage, when, with no calumniator pressing and no controversy yet arisen, "a persuasion without snares clung to souls," as Basil (Ep. 125, n. 3) describes the condition of doctrine prior to the middle of the fourth century regarding the very divinity of the Holy Spirit (see Th. XXXV, in the proem).

Note: He notes this about the doctrine of the Roman Church after he had said many things from which the exact contrary ought altogether to have been inferred. Pope Leo I, as Langen himself

admits, where he employs the formulas of the symbols, altogether teaches the procession "from the Father and the Son," or "from both" (p. 77). In that very sixth century, not long before Pelagius I, Hormisdas, his predecessor, set forth the faith to the emperor Justin, that it is proper to the Holy Spirit "ut de Patre et Filio procederet sub una substantia deitatis" (p. 103). See our Thesis XXXV. Moreover, if we believe Langen, the form of the doctrine of the procession "from the Father and the Son," cultivated by Augustine, prevailed more and more over time in the Western Church. But for Augustine—as Langen very truly affirms—the biblical formula was equivalent: that the third Person is the Spirit sicut Patris ita Filii, and the other, that the Spirit proceeds ex Patre Filioque (p. 76). Langen also most truly attests that, in this same sixth century, the doctrine of the procession "from the Father and the Son" was so firmly rooted among Westerners in the "dogmatischen Bewusstsein" that Fulgentius inculcated it, in the strictest form, as a dogma of faith, no otherwise than as it is contained in the Athanasian Creed (p. 103). This very Athanasian Creed, Langen admits, was published in the fifth century, and from it it is clear that, at that time, the faith of the procession "from the Father and the Son" had already been sufficiently universally received in the West; later there was attributed to that symbol canonical authority (p. 78). He ought to have added that, already in the sixth century, it had been prescribed to all presbyters and to deacons or subdeacons to have it by heart (vide Ballerinii, Opp. s. Leonis, Tom. III, p. 955). Shortly after Pelagius, at the waning of the sixth century, Gregory the Great persisted in the form of doctrine common to Westerners: "Spiritum Sanctum procedere a Patre Filioque" (p. 106). In this state of affairs, when Pelagius I professes that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, what, I ask, is to be inferred except that, for Pelagius also—"secundum communem occidentalium doctrinam"—it was most

certain that the Spirit of the Father and of the Son is breathed forth by the Father and the Son?

a) Now, if we take up the documents and testimonies as they are produced by Langen, there is evident the consensus of all ecclesiastical writers in the very substance of the doctrine: that the third Person of the Most Holy Trinity proceeds from the first Person not without the second Person being presupposed; and hence the third Person has a real relation of origin not only to the first but also to the second Person, and therefore the Holy Spirit is to be believed to receive the essence and all perfections, or to shine forth and proceed, from the Father through the Son, or from the Father and the Son. This doctrine, in varying modes of speech and also with various proofs, is found as one and the same among the doctors of the Churches of Egypt, Cyprus, Asia Minor, Palestine, Pontus, Antioch, Africa, Spain, Gaul, Italy—in a word, of the whole East and West—from the second to the ninth century. Therefore it is not the private opinion of a few, but the universal judgment of the Church.

b) The Fathers present the doctrine, either in entire disputations or by a simple appeal to the words of Christ and the Apostles—especially to what is said, that the Spirit "receives" from the Son, and that he is, as the Spirit of the Father, so also the Spirit of the Son—as consigned and expressed in the Scriptures: Athanasius, Marcellus, Hilary, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, Didymus, Ambrose, Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine, Vigilius of Thapsus, Cyril of Alexandria, Gelasius of Cyzicus, Anastasius of Antioch, Pelagius I, Gregory the Great, John of Damascus.

Note that Marcellus of Ancyra was most vehemently attacked by the Arians and accused of Sabellianism, but was held to be orthodox by Pope Julius I, by Athanasius, and by the Council of Sardica—though he remained suspect to some, such as Basil. Eusebius, manifestly Arian in his doctrine on the Holy Spirit (vide

Tract. de Trin. ed. 2ª, p. 490), when attacking Marcellus, reports some things said by him (De eccles. theologia III, c. 4). Marcellus argues most rightly there against the Arian Asterius: "Spiritus Sanctus procedit a Patre, et accipit a Filio, ut Christus ipse docet. Accipere autem a Filio idem valet ac procedere a Filio." Now, a procession "from the Father" and at the same time "from the Son" could not be conceived if—as Asterius teaches—the Father and the Son were personae divisae invicem (δύο διαιρούμενα πρόσωπα), namely, distinct and diverse in natures; for since procession from one Person is indeed perfect, in that Arian—or tritheistic—hypothesis nothing would remain for the other, divided Person whereby it might concur in the procession of the Holy Spirit (cf. above p. 164). Therefore this very fact—that the Holy Spirit proceeds from two Persons, the Father and the Son—is a manifest argument that the Father and the Son, under the formal aspect of the spirating power, and therefore also as to substance, are neither divided nor distinguished, but are absolutely one. From these things Marcellus concludes that Asterius did not speak rightly or suitably in saying "three hypostases," in that signification in which at that time—as "substantia" among Westerners, so "hypostasis" among many Easterners, for example in the symbol appended to the Council of Sardica, by Paulinus of Antioch with his adherents, with Athanasius not opposing, by Jerome and others—was understood as this singular existing nature or οὐσία (vide Tract. de Trin. Th. IX, n. II). Now Langen accuses this Catholic doctrine—that the Father and the Son are not distinguished either in the spirating power or in substance—of Sabellianism (pp. 23, 33). By such disputation he indeed shows that he has not grasped the Catholic doctrine of the numerical unity of the divine nature and of the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Father and the Son as from one principle"—just as the Photians likewise pervert it, reproaching Catholics with Sabellianism because we profess that the

Father and the Son, in the spiration of the Holy Spirit, are one principle of the Holy Spirit. Langen says (p. 8): "in pugna adversus apertum vel occultum Sabellianismum quemadmodum etiam contra Pneumatomachos in promptu erat (Patribus), ut processionem (Spiritus Sancti) a Patre vehementius urgerent, vel omnino processionem etiam a Filio refutarent, contra Arianos vero processionem a Patre Filioque defenderent." But these things are purely fictitious. No testimony is produced or can be produced in which anyone, against the Sabellians, refuted the procession also "from the Son." For if perchance these statements are referred to the mode of speaking of SS. Maximus and Damascene, they—not against the Sabellians, but rather against the Arian error which asserted that the Spirit does not proceed from the Father in the unity of nature but is created by the Son—preferred to say "the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son" rather than "from the Son," lest the Son should seem, apart from the Father and not by a power communicated from the Father, to be a principle of the Holy Spirit. Against the Sabellians, rather, the explicit assertion of the procession "from the Son" had more force, since, according to the teaching of the Fathers, just as the divine Persons in general, so the Son is not distinguished from the Spirit except as the principle from the one proceeding from that very principle (τῷ τῆς αἰτίας λόγῳ). As for the Arians, those very Fathers who otherwise more frequently and emphatically declared the procession "from the Father and the Son" —Didymus, Epiphanius, Cyril, Augustine, Fulgentius—when they disputed directly against the Arians concerning the Holy Spirit, more explicitly urged the procession "from the Father" to demonstrate the divinity of the Spirit, presupposing that the same procession also "from the Son" was already included in this. Afterwards, following Pope St Leo I, the Councils of Spain insisted on the explicit profession of the Spirit "procedentis a Patre Filioque." The reason and

occasion arose from the heresy of the Priscillianists, who—no otherwise than the Sabellians—denied the real distinction of the Persons (vide Conc. Toletani I, can. 2, 3, 4; Hardouin, T. I, p. 993).

Simply the Christian truth itself is stated by Tertullian, Origen, Gregory Nazianzen, Paulinus of Nola ("Christus coelestia dona profudit, Spiritum ab Unigena Sanctum et Patre procedentem," Migne, T. LXI, p. 650), Leo I, Maximus.

c) Moreover, in the very passages cited by Langen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Marius Victorinus, Epiphanius, the Councils of Toledo, the Athanasian Creed, Gennadius, Hormisdas (writing to Justin, emperor of the East), Fulgentius, the Council of Hatfield under Theodore—Greek by birth and learning—Tarasius with the approbation of the Seventh Council, the Synod of Friuli, Charlemagne, Hadrian I, Leo III, proclaim the procession "through the Son" or "from the Son" as an article of the dogma to be believed, either in symbols and professions of faith or by explicit declaration. Now then, when in the ninth century contradiction was first heard against this universal preaching, what was to be done both by individual Catholic doctors and by the whole Church? Clearly, according to the rule which Vincent of Lérins says he learned "from very many men outstanding in holiness and doctrine," Catholics took pains "to bring together and compare with one another the opinions of the ancients—of those, namely, who, though living at different times and places, yet remaining in the communion of the one Catholic Church, had been approved teachers—and whatever they knew that not merely one or two, but all alike with one and the same consent had openly, frequently, and steadfastly held, written, and taught, that they understood must also be believed by themselves without any hesitation" (Commonitorium, nn. 3, 27). "Now the Church of Christ, the diligent and cautious guardian of the dogmas deposited with her, with all industry strives after this one thing: that,

by treating what is old faithfully and wisely, if there are things that were fashioned and begun long ago, she may bring them to completion and polish them; if there are things already expressed and brought forth, she may consolidate and strengthen them; if there are things already confirmed and defined, she may keep them. Finally, what has the Church ever aimed at in the decrees of Councils, except that what was previously believed simply should afterwards be believed more carefully; what was previously preached more slowly should afterwards be preached more urgently; what was previously cultivated with greater security should afterwards be cultivated with greater solicitude?" (ibid., n. 23).

Indeed, if the profession in symbols, the definition in Councils—both particular and general (Aachen, Friuli, Worms, Bari, Lateran IV, Lyons II, Florence)—and the universal, explicit consensus regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, as an article of revealed faith, from the ninth century onward after the contrary heresy had already arisen, be compared with the preaching of the Church in the preceding ages as far back as ecclesiastical monuments extend—even as they are presented by Langen—a perfect harmony is found in both stages, with only that difference which follows from the different condition itself of simple faith, when as yet "no calumniator pressed," and of the necessary defense, when the avowed heretic harassed the Church of God. In this latter stage, namely, the Church of Christ—by treating what is old faithfully and wisely, by polishing what had been begun, by strengthening what had already been expressed, by guarding what had already been confirmed—brought it about that the faith, preaching, and explanation, previously simpler, slower, more secure, now, by the necessity of defense, became more careful, more urgent, more solicitous.

If this most splendid linkage of the final explication with the homogeneous preaching of all the foregoing ages back to apostolic times, and with the doctrine consigned in the very evangelical and apostolic Scriptures, as it has always been understood, seems insufficient to the Neo-Photians for demonstrating apostolic tradition in the Church of Christ, then indeed not only is the Church's office for the infallible custody and explication of the deposit and the whole principle of divine Tradition denied, but even historical faith itself is called into question. Thus not only the Catholic and theological demonstration of this dogma revealed, but of all dogmas, is subverted. For scarcely any dogma can be found for which the testimony of tradition—continuous and cohering in an unbroken series, universal in times and places—shines more brilliantly than for this very procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son.

Note: The symbol in the Eastern Churches, customarily used for catechumens as an explanation of the Constantinopolitan Creed, which Epiphanius describes and about which we have treated in Tract. de Trin. Thesis XXXVIII, is also adduced by Langen—but certainly with a false interpretation, which is that of Petavius as well. The text reads: «καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα πιστεύομεν... οὕτως δὲ πιστεύομεν ἐν αὐτῷ, ὅτι ἐστὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, πνεῦμα τέλειον, πνεῦμα παράκλητον, ἄκτιστον, ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ λαμβανόμενον καὶ πιστευόμενον. Πιστεύομεν εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν.» In the Petavian edition it is translated: "Ita porro nos in ipsum credimus, Spiritum esse sanctum, Dei Spiritum... a Patre procedentem, accipientem a Filio, in quem credimus." Langen follows this interpretation; but, he says, that «καὶ πιστευόμενον» has no genuine sense, since already earlier it had been said: "ita in ipsum credimus"; he suspects a scribal error, and that one should read «πιστεύομεν», which would refer to the following «εἰς

μίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν». Yet there is no place for this correction; for in the following clause «πιστεύομεν» is already expressed. Therefore the clause «καὶ πιστευόμενον» most certainly pertains to the Holy Spirit. Moreover, just as the other predicates—namely, that the Spirit is holy, the Spirit of God, perfect, Paraclete, uncreated, proceeding from the Father, receiving from the Son—so also, evidently, the last predicate, most closely and intimately connected with the preceding "receiving," namely "and being believed," constitutes the object that is believed. But it is plainly absurd to say, as in the printed translation, "we believe that the Spirit is believed." What then is to be done? Nothing other than to leave the words without mutilation; for the present Greek reading has a most clear sense, the one common to all the Fathers: we believe the Holy Spirit, who is "proceeding from the Father," and "receiving from the Son," and "(being) believed." Namely, that «ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ» refers to the two connected predicates: "receiving" and "(being) believed from the Son." From this formula of the symbol Epiphanius, in the same book Ancoratus n. 67, expressed his own explanation: "Christus ex Patre creditur Deus de Deo et Spiritus Sanctus ex Christo, sive ab utroque, sicut docet ipse Christus, qui a Patre procedit, et hic de meo accipiet." That in the symbol «τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ πιστευόμενον» is parallel to the other statement at n. 67, «Χριστὸς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς πιστεύεται καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἢ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων». A not dissimilar form is presented by the sentence of Gregory of Nyssa, about which we spoke in Th. XXXV: «τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς λέγεται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ εἶναι προσμαρτυρεῖται», "Spiritus Sanctus et ex Patre dicitur et ex Filio esse simul confirmatur."

§. IV.

The Fallacy of the Neo-Protestants Concerning the Origin of the Catholic Consensus in Doctrine of Faith.

The reasons which the "Professor of Catholic Theology" adduces in order to persuade us of his invention—that the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son is not a revealed dogma of faith, however much the doctrine had been proposed and explicated by the unanimous consensus of the Fathers even before the rise of the Photian schism—cannot be admitted without, as we said, overthrowing the whole principle of Tradition. We shall examine these Langenian reasons, part by part, in this and the following paragraphs.

His first stratagem is of this sort. The doctrine, he says, common among the Greeks—that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son—has Athanasius as its founder (Begründer). From Athanasius, Hilary brought it into the West (pp. 123–124). Hence Langen, speaking in a manner genuinely Protestant, even calls it the "later Athanasian orthodoxy" (posteriorem orthodoxiam Athanasianam, p. 80). Augustine, he says, must be reckoned "the true author of the Western doctrine" (der eigentliche Urheber der abendländischen Lehre), namely, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son (pp. 63, 76, 125). Setting aside the distinction between the particles "from the Son" and "through the Son," about which Langen's fabrication and contradiction have already been discussed, let us here consider only what he narrates about the authors of the doctrine.

1º Langen himself admits that, in all ecclesiastical documents in which there is speech about the origin and relation of the Holy Spirit prior to Athanasius, among Tertullian, Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, "the doctrine is the same as to the thing itself concerning the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son," which Athanasius set forth more distinctly (p. 21; cf. pp. 13, 15). He admits that, even before Augustine, the doctrine had been expressed in this

very formula: that the Spirit is from the Father and the Son, that his authors are the Father and the Son, that he proceeds from the Father and the Son; for thus taught Tertullian, Marcellus, Hilary, Marius Victorinus, Epiphanius, Didymus and his interpreter Jerome, Ambrose, the First Council of Toledo (197)—to whom should be added Athanasius himself and, according to the genuine reading, Basil and his own brother Gregory of Nyssa. It is manifest, therefore, that Athanasius and Augustine are not the authors of the doctrine, but found it handed down in the Church. And thus they explicated and confirmed it more distinctly—not disputing polemically about the procession from the Son, since in this matter no calumniator was pressing—but supposing and proposing the Church's doctrine, about which no question had yet been raised, for the explanation of unity and distinction in the mystery of the Trinity and for the instruction of the faithful, as Augustine for the most part does, or employing it to defend other dogmas against heretics, as Athanasius is wont to dispute—for the defense, I say, of the divinity of the Son, on the ground that from him proceeds God the Holy Spirit; or, against those who conceded the divine nature to the Son but denied it to the Holy Spirit, for asserting this very divinity of the Holy Spirit from his procession from God the Father and the Son—or (what comes to the same thing) from the Father through the Son.

2° Athanasius and Augustine, like all the other Fathers who treat more expressly of the origin of the Holy Spirit, present the procession "from the Father and the Son" or "through the Son" as expressed in the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles, and thus as a

---

197 Langen (p. 62) reports—and, while mentioning only some "doubt," admits—the symbol as though issued in this First Synod of Toledo, in which the Fathers profess: "credimus... Spiritum quoque Paracletum esse, qui nec Pater sit ipse nec Filius, sed a Patre Filioque procedens" (Hardouin I, 993). We have spoken of this in Tract. de Trin. ed. 2, p. 512.

revealed doctrine—most especially in this: that the Spirit is said to "receive" from the Son, just as the Son "receives all things" from the Father; and that he is taught to be, as the Spirit of the Father, so also the Spirit of the Son, by a proper and hence relative personal name. They treat this doctrine, as we said, both supposing it in the persuasion of the faithful and employing it to confirm other dogmas of faith. What is said, then, of Athanasius and Augustine holds of the doctrine of the other Fathers, which Augustine himself notes in another dogma: "It was guarded by such constancy in the Church's faith that by those who handled the divine sayings it was more confidently produced for the refutation of other falsehoods than that anyone attempted to refute it as false" (Aug., De peccatorum meritis et remissione, III, n. 14). If they propose and presuppose, in Scripture, a doctrine believed in faith, by what reasoning, pray, can they themselves be accounted its authors?

3º If we suppose for a moment—what is most false—that, from the monuments of the Fathers that have come down to us, Athanasius in the East and Augustine in the West are found as the first asserters of this dogma, what would follow therefrom? Whoever reads the names of the Fathers set down above, taken from Langen himself, cannot deny that in the fourth century, in the age of Athanasius, and likewise at the beginning of the fifth century and thereafter, the doctrine was held in the unanimous consensus of the doctors of the Church, East and West. None of the Fathers of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh century ever appealed either to the authority of Athanasius or of Augustine; rather, all of them propose the dogma as included either in the explicit words of Scripture, or in the revealed doctrine concerning the unity, distinction, and order of

the divine Persons, or in the faith and tradition of the Church (198). From the consensus, therefore, of all the doctors with the doctrine of Athanasius and Augustine (even under the hypothesis we have allowed), it would by no means be to be inferred that the authority of these two Fathers was the cause of that universal consensus—as if all the rest, like blind men, had followed human authors of divine faith; rather, the authority of Athanasius and Augustine in this matter arises also from their agreement with the common doctrine of the Church. What must be repeated of Athanasius and Augustine is what Augustine himself says of Gregory Nazianzen and John Chrysostom on another point of doctrine: "He is indeed a person of such weight that neither would he say this except from the Christian faith most widely known, nor would they hold him in such clear honor and veneration unless they recognized that these things said by him are from the rule of most well-known truth." "Far be it that you (John) should think otherwise, and yet shine forth as so pre-eminent in that (Church)" (Aug., Contra Julianum, I, nn. 16, 22). In every age, indeed, what Vincent of Lérins (c. 23) recommends in general was a

198 To this category, by name, are to be referred the professions of faith mentioned above, in which the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, or through the Son, is inserted. But even with respect to the universal profession and the symbols of faith, our disputant is not without a plan. One asks by what rationale, in the year 400, the article of faith was inserted into the very Constantinopolitan symbol. Here is the ready explanation: "the frequent reading in the West of the book of Didymus De Spiritu Sancto must have brought it about that the formula of the procession from the Father and the Son was widely taken into use." Yet neither that frequent reading nor an effect of this kind (from the year 386, in which Jerome translated the book into Latin, to the year 400) can in any way be proved; but so it must be. Die im Abendlande viel gelesene Schrift des Didymus muss dort die Formel sehr in Umlauf gebracht haben (p. 62).

great thing and necessary to recall: that all who are truly Catholic should know that they ought to receive the doctors (individual private ones) with the Church, not to forsake the faith with the doctors against the Church. Far be it, therefore, that the doctors in the Church—even if they had the name and glory of an Athanasius or an Augustine—were ever received as authors of the doctrine of faith.

§ V.
Concealment of the Documents of Antiquity in Which the Article of Faith is Expressly Affirmed

The chief argument of Neophotianism—indeed the marrow of Langen's whole dissertation—for overturning belief in a revealed dogma, is this: it is asserted that the Fathers did not present the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit also from the Son or through the Son as a dogma of divine tradition, but only as a matter of theological speculation, which, however true it may be, neither does constitute nor can constitute an article of the Catholic faith. In order to persuade readers of so unheard-of a claim—precisely where the question concerns the unanimous agreement of the Fathers in a mystery of Christian doctrine, an agreement which Langen not only concedes but even demonstrates—he considers each Father in isolation, paying no heed to the agreement into one and the same judgment from the second to the ninth century, in East and West, and setting wholly aside the further explication and confirmation of that same consensus; about which subversion of the Church's infallibility in the guarding and explication of the deposit we have already spoken. In particular, for this very purpose he maliciously suppresses and skips over the force and weight above all of those documents in which the procession "from the Son" or "through the

Son" is expressly proposed as an article of the Catholic faith, as though they expressed only a merely private opinion.

Let us examine for a little these artifices devised to prop up a very bad cause—artifices which we shall show to be bad not on other grounds but from Langen's own statements.

1º The profession in which the Holy Spirit is said "to proceed from the Father through the Son, and also to have the essence from the Son," Langen admits was already, by the middle of the fourth century, recited by Marius Victorinus in a creed against the Arians and thus "common doctrine of the Church," a settled judgment founded on the words of Christ in John 16:14 (199). In that same period, when Didymus of Alexandria—Jerome, his interpreter, agreeing—taught that the Spirit has the essence from the Son just as the Son has it from the Father, and hence that He proceeds from the Father and the Son, that is, that He is "from the Father and the Son," this doctrine, "since Jerome bore witness that Didymus was certainly Catholic in the dogma of the Trinity," "was widely diffused in the West" (200). At that very time Epiphanius described a creed "used throughout the whole Church in the conferral of baptism," in which it is already said that "it must be believed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son"; and in that same creed (of the whole Church) the texts John 15:26 and 16:14 appear as dogmatic formulae concerning the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son. Epiphanius therefore recognized, as public and apostolic and thus as Catholic doctrine of the Church, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son

199 Die gewöhnlich kirchliche... feststehende auf Ioh. XVI. 14. gegründete Anschauung Langen, p. 28, 124.

200 Ibid p. 28, 61.

([201]). From this our author, speaking of the Second Council, acknowledges that the judgment concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father through the Son "was in the theology of that age (the fourth century) universal, which without doubt even the Fathers of the Council favored." And the reason why they did not express it in the creed—he alleges—is not now that they judged it did not pertain to faith, but that the doctrine of procession "from the Father," over against the Macedonians, sufficed ([202]). The same dogma is described as "the dominant tradition in the East" ([203]); "a doctrine universal among the Greeks" ([204]); "the Greek theological tradition propagated by Eastern doctors of the Church"; "the traditional doctrine of the Easterners"; "a positive tradition," distinguished from

[201] Ibid p. 42, 54, 124. The Professor attempts (p. 42) to wriggle out of this by: a) attributing the statement to Epiphanius himself. But a little earlier he had confessed—and on p. 54 again confesses—that this profession belonged to the creed of the whole Church. b) He would cast a veil because (as he says) Epiphanius by no means declares what he understood by the phrase "to receive from the Son."

[202] Ibid. p. 61.

[203] Ibid. p. 105. Die in Orient herrschende Ueberlieferung.

[204] Ibid. p. 125.

theological speculation; "up to the beginning of the fifth century, unanimous as to substance" (205).

But to reply, α) Epiphanius very clearly explains that "receiving from the Son" means nothing other to him than "being from the Son" (Ancoratus, n. 67; see above, p. 52).

β) Langen himself (p. 5) affirms that the question about the origin of the Holy Spirit "also from the Son" would be decided, if Christ had not said ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ ("from what is mine") but ἐξ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται ("from me he will receive"; see above, p. 247). Now in that very creed of the whole Church and by Epiphanius, as Langen admits, the words of Christ were explained in this one sense: "he receives from the Son."

γ) A little below (p. 124), our theologian himself, forgetful of what on p. 42 he had said, without hesitation affirms that in the Epiphanian creed, by the words "the Spirit receives from the Son," the doctrine of procession "through the Son" is explicitly expressed.

δ) To say that the Spirit receives anything from the Son in any other way than by procession cannot be said without the Macedonian heresy and a denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit—an impiety which not even the Professor ascribes to Epiphanius, who wrote Ancoratus precisely to refute that heresy.

---

205 Ibid. p. 63–64. As for the fiction which the author here thrusts in—as though Augustine had "to some extent altered" the tradition of procession "from the Father through the Son" by speculation about procession "from the Father and the Son"—we already know what value there is in this difference between the two formulae. Just as here Langen says that up to Augustine the doctrine was "unanimous as to substance," so a little later (p. 126) he himself admits that between the Augustinian doctrine ("from the Father and the Son") and that of the Greek Fathers (παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ) "there is no essential difference."

ε) Otherwise, Epiphanius's doctrine of procession from the Father and the Son is everywhere clear and evident (see De Trinitate, Thesis XXXV). The fact that the Holy Spirit is, and is called, the Spirit "of the Son," not only by reason of a temporal mission from the Son, but on account of an immanent essential relation to the Son, "was a doctrine never called into doubt by the whole ancient Church and by all the Fathers" ([206]).

From what has been said it is already clear that we are not dealing only with "a tradition in the East" and "a doctrine universal among the Greeks," but that one must recognize as well the common doctrine of the Church—a doctrine widely diffused no less in the West—and finally a doctrine never called into doubt by the whole ancient Church. Yet let us, following Langen's lead, consult more distinctly the faith and profession of the Westerners—removing, of course, the figment which the author introduces when he strives to

---

[206] Ibid. p. 110. Die niemals bezweifelte Lehre der ganzen alten Kirche und aller Vaeter. Thus Langen acknowledges that, in the words of Scripture where the Spirit is called the "Spirit of the Son," there is contained —and that it was always believed by the whole Church—an immanent essential relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son (immanente Wesensbeziehung des h. Geistes zum Sohne). Such an immanent relation among the divine persons is, to be sure, neither other than nor even conceivable except as a relation of origin. How then could the Professor, earlier (pp. 4–5) and later (p. 125), have asserted that nothing about the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son—but only His consubstantiality with the Son—is taught in Scripture and in the tradition of faith? There he interprets the Scriptural name proper to the third person, "Spirit of the Son," of an essential conjunction or unity with the Son (Wesensverbindung), whereas here, in the passage under discussion, he finally admits that that appellation has always been understood—and must be understood—of an immanent relation to the Son (Wesensbeziehung zum Sohne). Clearly, one who defends a very bad cause does not care for a good brief.

obscure the universal agreement, as though the Easterners, when they taught that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, that He receives and has the essence as from the Father so also from the Son, and therefore is "from the Father and the Son," meant one thing for themselves, while the Westerners expressed something different by professing procession "from the Father and the Son."

2º Already in the year 400 the First Council of Toledo perhaps adopted into a creed the doctrine of procession "from the Father and the Son," and held it as "a symbolic tradition of faith" (207); in the fifth century Paulinus of Nola adopted it "as a formula self-evident in doctrine on the Most Holy Trinity" (208); Pope Leo I proposes it "as a creedal formula" (209); following the Pope's doctrine, the Second Council of Toledo sets it down—or repeats it—in a creed (210). After the middle of the fifth century, in the Athanasian Creed the same profession, in the strictest form, is proposed "as an

207 Ibid. p. 63, 76. Symbolische Glaubensüberlieferung.

208 bid. p. 77.

209 bid. p. 77.

210 bid. p. 78.

undoubted dogma of faith" (211). Likewise Gennadius of Marseilles includes it among the dogmas of faith in his creed, and Fulgentius of Ruspe in many places counts it among the most certain articles of faith: "so unshakably in that age, in the West, the profession of procession 'from the Father and the Son' was grounded in dogmatic conviction" (212). In the Third Council of Toledo it was inserted, and then by other councils in a long series down to the seventh century it was repeated in the creed, that the Holy Spirit "proceeds from the Father and the Son" (213). An English council under Theodore of Canterbury in the year 680, "following the five ecumenical councils and the Roman council under Martin I, the First Lateran," professes the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and

211 Ibid. p. 78, 125. What Langen alone concludes—that from this most stringent form it appears the doctrine, after the mid–fifth century, had been in the West "fairly generally accepted" (ziemlich allgemein angenommen)—is the evasion of a man hunting for subterfuges. Under the necessity of salvation and the threat of eternal damnation, nothing could have been proposed unless it were an indubitable article of faith; or at least such a document would never have been received with the authority of faith —just as we see that this Symbol, even before the rise of the Photian heresy, specifically with respect to the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, had been received as an exposition of the Catholic faith which the universal Church confesses (supra p. 71 sq.; cf. Tract. de Trin., ed. 2, p. 513).

212 Ibid. p. 80, 103, 125. So fest war das Filioque damals im Abendlande bereits in dem dogmatischen Bewusstsein begründet.

213 Ibid. p. 106.

the Son (214). No less is the same doctrine presupposed as an article of faith by Hadrian I; it is defined by the Council of Friuli; and by Leo III in a profession of faith for all the Eastern Churches (215).

At last let us sum up all these documents. That the Holy Spirit proceeds "from the Father through the Son" or "from the Father and the Son," since, when these are understood in the Catholic sense of the Fathers, there is no real—indeed, as Langen admits, no essential—difference between them: in what manner, I ask, is this taught in the monuments admitted and acknowledged by the very disputant of Bonn, from at least the middle of the fourth century (when men began to treat more explicitly about the Holy Spirit) down to the rise of contradiction in the ninth? Everywhere, as Langen admits, it stands forth as "the common doctrine of the Church," "established in dogmatic conviction," "the Catholic doctrine of the Church," "the doctrine of the whole Church and of all the Fathers,

---

214 Ibid. p. 107. Take in passing the label "the First Lateran Council." It appears Langen counts that synod under Martin I (A.D. 649) among the ecumenical Lateran councils; otherwise a man so ἱστορικώτατος could not have called it "first" among the Lateran councils. Hence he will be forced to acknowledge at least one or another of the five ecumenical Lateran councils from the year 1123 to 1517. How he can reconcile this with his Neoprotestant denial of Catholic principles, and persuade his fellow sectarians of the same, is his affair.

215 Ibid. p. 121–122. It is a monstrosity not only theological but also historical (cf. supra pp. 86 sqq.) which our Neoprotestant adds here: that Charlemagne, at the Synod of Aachen, issued a decree that the Filioque is to be inserted into the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Symbol (Karl der Grosse aber decretirte auf der Synode zu Aachen, dass das Filioque in dem Nic. CP. Symbolum mit aufzuführen sei). What is insinuated, evidently, is some model from Neoprotestant synods, in which laymen are chiefly the ones to decide ecclesiastical matters.

never called into doubt," "the dominant tradition," a "positive tradition," distinguished from theological speculation and argumentation, received as "a doctrine founded in the Scriptures," proposed "as an article of faith to be believed" in professions of faith and in creeds of both East and West.

From all this, what do you suppose will be the conclusion of our disputant? The conclusion is: the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Father through the Son" or "from the Son" is "a theological opinion" that "belongs to speculation," not however "from apostolic tradition," and therefore not a dogma of faith!! Here, to be sure, not only all the principles of Catholic Tradition but even of logic and sound reason are overthrown—which necessarily happens because apostate men wish to cloak their own fancies, and especially the very foundations of their heresy, with certain expressions and modes of speaking that are Catholic, and of which they still retain a memory from their Catholic upbringing (216).

§. VI.
The Neophotian Twisting of the Unanimous Doctrine of the Fathers by a Fallacious Comparison of Passages

To the explicit statements of individual Fathers—and, by unanimous consent, to the universal doctrine—on the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Son" or "through the Son," Langen, with an entirely Photian line of argument, opposes other passages from the same Fathers in which they deal only with faith in one God in Trinity

---

216 Tertullian and other pre-Nicene Fathers truly taught the unity of the divine substance in three really distinct persons; we demonstrated this, against certain more recent theologians (whose opinion Langen too has made his own), in the Tractatus de Trinitate, Theses X–XI (ed. 2, pp. 155, 172 sqq.).

and thus with the divinity of the Holy Spirit, without expressly requiring a profession of procession. Whence, just as the Photian Easterners (as we saw in Macarius) absurdly dare to infer, from a similar argument, that the Fathers denied procession from the Son, so the Neophotian of Bonn concludes—not, indeed, that the Fathers denied this procession, but only that they reckoned it not among truths of faith to be believed, but among "theological opinions and speculations."

But in fact, from its very form and character, the entire argument shows itself to be inept. Either the adversary affirms that the Fathers counted only those truths among the dogmas of faith which, in those passages he adduces, they explicitly vindicate against heretics; or else he concedes that in such passages only those dogmas are mentioned whose defense was required by the attack of the contrary heresy, by the state of the question under discussion, by the context of the disputation. If he says the first, then many revealed truths, and notably the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Father," of which in most of those places there is no mention, would have to be removed from the catalogue of dogmas of faith; and in addition there would be established a hermeneutical principle that is evidently absurd—namely, that nothing pertains to faith unless the Fathers, in all their disputations against heretics, explicitly asserted and vindicated it as a dogma of faith. If, of the two positions we set forth, he concedes the other, then from those same patristic passages it will no more follow that the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Son" or "through the Son" was counted not among truths of faith but among merely theological opinions, than that procession "from the Father," and many other dogmas of which there is there no mention, were thus relegated.

To make clearer what we are saying, let us briefly examine the several observations which it pleased the "Professor of Theology" to

append after he had described the manifest doctrine of the Fathers on procession "from the Son" or "through the Son."

1º Tertullian defends against Praxeas the real distinction of the three persons (οἰκονομίαν), with the unity of substance, of operation, and of dominion (τῇ μοναρχίᾳ) remaining intact (217)—for Praxeas, like Noetus and Sabellius, thought that this unity in God, that is, the monarchy, could subsist only if the real distinction of persons were denied. Now the unity of substance—and therefore the unity of operation and of dominion—coheres with the distinction of persons because the divine substance, being one and indivisible, is at the same time communicable, and is communicated by the Father to the Son, and by the Father and the Son to the third person (in the order of origin), the Holy Spirit; for without this communication it would be quite true, as the heretics said, that there are multiple substances where there are multiple distinct persons. But just as the distinction of persons—denied by the heretics—rests solely on revelation handed on by the Church and guarded in the Church, so does this communication of substance. Hence, seeing in the revelation of unity and distinction the revelation of a communication of substance included, Tertullian proposes and defends both in the same way against the heretics. It is therefore absurd to say that Tertullian found the distinction of persons together with the unity of substance in Christian tradition, but that the communication of substance—about which he speaks in the same manner as of that monarchy, and without which the monarchy to be admitted would not be Catholic

217 A little above he had said: "Sermo (Verbum) et in Patre semper (Io. XIV. 10.) et apud Deum semper (Io. I. 1.), et numquam separatus a Patre aut alius (alius Deus seu aliud) a Patre, quia ego et Pater unum sumus (Io. X. 30.)." Below, c. 22: "Caeci qui non videant... sumus non ex unius esse persona, quod pluraliter dictum est; tum quod unum sumus, non unus sumus..., ostendit duos esse, quos aequat et iungit."

but Praxean—he held not as a doctrine of revelation and Christian tradition but as a mere theological opinion. Into this absurdity, not by any argumentation but by a merely arbitrary assertion, Langen falls.

He recites the doctrine of Tertullian: "I derive the Son from no other source but from the substance of the Father... How can I, in the faith (i.e., in this Catholic faith), destroy the monarchy which, handed on by the Father to the Son, I hold in the Son? Let me say this also for the third degree, because I think that the Spirit is from no other source than from the Father through the Son." "Everything that goes forth from something must be a second of that from which it goes forth, yet is not therefore separated" (218). "But where there is a second, there are two; and a third, where there are three. For the third is the Spirit from God (the Father) and the Son; as the third from the root is the fruit from the shrub, and the third from the spring is the

---

218 Tertullian frequently insists (de Praescript. c. 13; de veland. virg. c. 1; cont. Prax. c. 2) that, for salvation, the rule of faith must be held, which (he says), instituted by Christ, raises no questions among us except those which heresies introduce—and which make men heretics. But he does not everywhere include all the same truths within that "rule." He appears, for example, to hand on a complete rule of faith (de veland. virgin. c. 1); indeed he concludes that, with that "law of faith" remaining, "the rest, now, as to discipline and conduct, admits of a corrective newness." Yet in that rule not even all the articles of the Apostles' Creed are contained, nor is there any mention of the Holy Spirit, to say nothing of other truths of faith. Plainly, in Tertullian—just as in the other Fathers—the items set down in such "rules," symbols, and expositions of faith all do pertain, but not exclusively, to the faith that must be believed. This principle, obvious and self-evident, the Neoprotestant refused to understand—in order, namely, as the proximate end of his little book, to eliminate the article on the procession of the Holy Spirit; and more generally to reduce the necessities of faith to very few, and finally to nothing. Indeed, in the very passage he cites (cont. Prax. c. 8), Langen has omitted that whole period on the "rule of profession."

stream from the river, and the third from the sun is the point of light from the ray. Yet nothing is alienated from the source from which it derives its properties. Thus the Trinity, running down through conjoined and linked gradations, neither clashes with the monarchy nor undermines the state of the οἰκονομία (that is, of the internal relations). This rule (219) of mine which I have professed—whereby I testify that the Father and the Son and the Spirit are inseparable from one another (according to the order of origin which I spoke of)—hold it everywhere" (Contra Praxean 4, 8).

Although Langen does not fully cite these things, he further adds that Tertullian considers the internal processions also in relation to the operations ad extra, and therefore deduces the procession of the Spirit from both from the mission of the Holy Spirit by the Father and the Son. If such a doctrine is found in Tertullian (220), it contains nothing other than an explication of an implicit revelation—since both from the very notion of "mission" in a divine person and from the Catholic understanding, made manifest by the consensus of the Fathers after Tertullian's age, it is certain that in the revelation of the

---

219 That doctrine can be considered to be set forth in c. 9 of Contra Praxean. There, after establishing from the mission of the Son by the Father the distinction and relation of the two persons, by the same reasoning he then concludes from the mission of the Holy Spirit by the Son the Spirit's distinction and relation to the Son: thus "alium a se Paracletum, quomodo et nos (in antecedentibus) a Patre alium Filium, ut tertium gradum ostenderet in Paracleto" (a little earlier, c. 8, he had said: "tertius est Spiritus a Deo et Filio"), "sicut nos secundum in Filio, propter οἰκονομίας observationem." It is false, however, as Langen claims, that in this book Contra Praxean the Holy Spirit is called the vicar of Christ; Tertullian so calls him in de Praescript. c. 28 and de veland. virg. c. 1, in wholly different contexts.

220 Alles andere mag er wohl nur als theologische Schlussfolgerungen betrachtet haben.

mission of one divine person by another there is implicitly contained the revealed procession of the one sent from the sender, as has been shown above (pp. 24 sqq.) and in De Trinitate, Thesis XXXIII.

Now hear the Professor's conclusion. He said two things: first, that Tertullian teaches the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Father and the Son" and "from the Father through the Son"; second, that Tertullian considered the operations ad extra in relation to the internal processions, and thus connected the procession of the same Spirit from the Son with the Spirit's mission by the Son. From these two points he immediately infers: "Therefore, in Tertullian, that 'through the Son' cannot have the value of ecclesiastical tradition" (p. 10). Surely this is an altogether new kind of dialectic, which Tertullian had not yet known; for in the ancient art of logic—especially if you do not, with Langen, suppress what the African doctor says about the 'rule of profession'—the inference would be altogether the contrary. Tertullian, contending against the heretics, proposes as a certain doctrine pertaining to the distinction and order of the divine persons—about which nothing can be known to us except from revelation—that the third person, the Spirit, proceeds from the Father and the Son, from the first person through the second; and he has this from the rule of Christian profession, and as founded on the Scriptures. Therefore, just as he held the procession from the Father, so no less did he hold the procession from the Son as a doctrine kept in the deposit of revelation and in the Church's profession, and thus as Christian tradition.

2º In the very clear doctrine of Saints Epiphanius, Cyril of Alexandria, and John Damascene—who set forth the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father "through the Son" or "from the Father and the Son" from the testimonies of Scripture and who assume it, as the common profession of the Church, to confirm other articles of faith attacked by heretics—our author finds not even the

least apparent reason for thinking that, in the case of these doctors, this truth was distinguished, as a theological speculation or opinion, from other truths of faith. Hence, by mere conjectures, he tries to cast some smoke.

"Epiphanius" (he says, p. 42) "indeed holds, as apostolic and Catholic doctrine of the Church, that the Spirit receives the essence from the Son; but he distinguishes that receiving from the procession —although, on the other hand, 'receiving from the Son' and 'proceeding from the Son' are so closely allied one to the other that he often declares the Spirit to be from both, from the Father and the Son." Of this fraudulent evasion by Langen we have spoken enough a little above (p. 276, note).

Cyril—if we are to believe the Neophotians—nowhere declared sufficiently what, in his theological explication of the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit, he held or did not hold as a dogma of faith. "Even when contending against Theodoret he always held it as indubitable that the Holy Spirit is proper to the Son, that He is as much the Spirit of the Son as of the Father; all the rest that he teaches about the immanent relations perhaps he held only as theological deductions" (however necessary those seemed to him) (221). I confess that I would not have expected an argument like this, even from Professor Reinkens. Cyril, in countless places, said that the Spirit is "proper" (ἴδιον) to the Son as He is to the Father—and he never meant this otherwise than to express the relation of origin to the Son, namely the procession "through the Son" or "from the Son." If, then, in the former point he recognized an indubitable dogma of faith, he most certainly held as a dogma of faith the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son no less than from the Father. Moreover, if Langen calls all declarations of one dogma from another, or of one

221 Vide Tract. de Deo Uno Th. X.

dogmatic formula from another, "deductions" by which the force of dogmas is to be excluded, then in this new heresy its followers must divest themselves, together with divine faith, of human reason as well.

St. John Damascene, as Langen admits, teaches that the Spirit "proceeds from the Father and rests in the Son," "proceeds from the Father through the Son," is "the image of the Son as the Son is the image of the Father," is "the mean between the Father and the Son," and "through the Son is conjoined with the Father." The Neophotian conclusion follows: "If we ask which among these statements John recognized as a binding dogma, perhaps they will be those which he contributes, so to speak, as a declaration in the Constantinopolitan Creed: that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and rests in the Son" (p. 120). Anyone can see that here the new dialectic which we marveled at a little earlier appears in full strength. Since all the statements adduced in Damascene signify one and the same reality—and if the mode of signifying somewhat differs, no reason can be found why there should be in some a greater, in others a lesser, force of obliging to faith concerning the relations among the divine persons—it must be inferred, not "perhaps," but certainly, that with Damascene all these statements—produced from the consensus of the preceding Fathers—have exactly the same value and are all referred to one point: namely, that according to clear Catholic doctrine and profession from the consensus of the Fathers, the Holy Spirit, by an eternal immanent relation, proceeds from the Father through the Son (see De Trinitate, Thesis XXXVI, n. II).

With the last we join the first of the Greek Fathers whom Langen adduces, so that from a comparison of both the license of the new hermeneutic may be set before our eyes. Gregory Thaumaturgus in his creed professes that, as the Son is the image and character of the Father, "the only-begotten from the only one," so the Holy Spirit is "the perfect image of the perfect Son," who "was always in the Son as

the Son is in the Father," and who finally "appeared" not only ad extra but also "in His personal relation ad intra through the Son." Langen does not deny that all this expresses procession from the Father through the Son, which indeed is manifest from the whole context (cf. De Trinitate, Thesis XXXV, n. I). You would think, therefore, that such a profession of Gregory, being in a creed, could not be denied by Langen to have the force of a binding dogma—since he himself, in the case of Damascene (as we saw), recognizes such force from the fact that a doctrine is set forth in a creed by way of explication. But in Neophotian dialectic the contrary is concluded. "With Gregory Thaumaturgus" (thus Langen concludes) "we do not have a brief and concise creed in which nothing other than the doctrine of the Church is proposed, but an explication of the creed according to the notions of the Origenist school; this explication of the creed is not presented to us as apostolic tradition" (p. 15). In Damascene, explication in a creed was a reason for affirming; in Gregory, the same is a reason for denying the force of dogma—a denial for which our theologian finds a wonderful confirmation in the lack of brevity of the creed. Surely, by this method, the creed of Neoprotestants will be the briefest—or, at pleasure, none at all.

3º Up to now we have seen nothing but mere negations fallaciously thrust upon us, by which a consenting and universal doctrine on an article of the mystery of the divine persons of the Trinity was declared—without any show of reason or proof—not to pertain to Christian faith, but to theological opinions and speculations. Now follow those Fathers from whom "the Professor of Theology" produces one or two testimonies to the divinity of the Holy Spirit without at the same time mentioning His procession "from the Son" or "through the Son"; whence he immediately concludes that, according to these holy doctors, the relation of the Spirit to the Son is to be counted not among the dogmas of the

Church but among particular theological opinions. We encounter the same form of argument among the ancient Photians—with this difference, however, that they truncate or suppress the passages attesting the procession "from the Son," producing only those in which there is silence about that procession; whereas the new Photians, not daring to go so far, describe sincerely most of the testimonies, with the result that those act more by frauds, these are caught in more manifest contradictions. Langen produces clear testimonies for the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Father through the Son" and "from the Son," drawn from the lengthy disputations in which Athanasius, Basil, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen, Hilary, Augustine, and Vigilius of Thapsus either demonstrate and declare the dogma from the Scriptures or else assume it as a known element of Christian teaching in order to refute other errors of the heretics; and then suddenly subjoins that these Fathers distinguished the doctrine thus proved and assumed most carefully from revealed dogmas, and that they held it among theological speculations. By what reason, I ask, is this distinction proved? Why then does a doctrine which is "deduced speculatively," which is proved, which is declared—which sorts of "speculations" the Fathers employ very often, e.g., regarding the generation and consubstantiality of the Son—not pertain to revealed dogmas? Receive the whole Neophotian "proof" of such a great distinction—or rather perversion.

Athanasius (says Langen) distinguishes accurately between theological speculation (to which, namely, all his declarations about procession "through the Son" and about receiving the whole essence "from the Son" are to belong) and tradition of faith (to which, he says, that doctrine does not belong). It is proved thus: "For Athanasius (Ad Serapionem IV, 7) says to the Homoiousians: 'It suffices that you believe that the Spirit is not a creature but that He is

the Spirit of God, and that in Him there is the Trinity: the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.' Likewise, in the fragment containing Athanasius's interpretation of the creed (Migne 26, 1231), among the predicates of the Holy Spirit there is no mention of procession; it is only said that He is not alien to the Father and the Son but consubstantial with the Father and the Son." From all which our theologian concludes: "Therefore, the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son, according to Athanasius, was the faith of the Church and the apostolic tradition about the Holy Spirit" (222).

You will be even more astonished at Langen's argument about Basil's doctrine. Basil "did not hold as handed on by Christ and as an object of faith" the doctrine—often and in many ways declared—of the procession of the Spirit "from the Father through the Only-Begotten." This is proved. What he acknowledged as essential doctrine of faith he reveals in De Spiritu Sancto c. 18, where he says: "Natural goodness and essential holiness and royal dignity flow from the Father through the Only-Begotten into the Spirit; in this way (οὕτω) the hypostases are believed, and the pious dogma of the unity of God (τῆς μοναρχίας) is not undermined." From this doctrine you would think that both the unity of essence in distinct persons and also its foundation—namely, the communication of essence from the Father through the Only-Begotten into the Holy Spirit—pertain to the same faith; but the dialectic of Bonn concludes the contrary in this way: "Therefore the essential unity in the Trinity of persons is, even for Basil, a doctrine necessarily to be held—apostolic and Catholic faith. The further explication and defense of this faith belongs to theological speculation" (p. 37).

---

222 On the sense in which the Fathers often seem to say that what is not written is not to be believed, see Tract. de Tradit. Th. XIX.

A deduction very similar to this the "Professor of Theology" serves us in the case of Cyril of Jerusalem. In the same way in which Athanasius said that "the Spirit has all things from the Word" (see De Trinitate, Thesis XXXV), and in which Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and others taught that "divine perfection flows from the Father through the Only-Begotten into the Spirit," so too did Cyril, in more than one place in the Catecheses, declare the dogma. Langen freely admits that such a declaration is found in Cyril; but he also asserts that "only the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit were held by Cyril as the object of faith." Cyril's words (Cat. XVI, 24) are these: "The Father indeed gives (δίδωσι) to the Son, and the Son communicates (μεταδίδωσι) to the Holy Spirit. For it is Jesus Himself, not I, who says: 'All things have been delivered to me by my Father' (Matt 11:27); and concerning the Holy Spirit He says... 'because he will receive (λαμβάνει) of mine and will declare (ἀναγγελεῖ) it to you.' The Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit bestows all things (one operation ad extra, but—as has been said—communicated from the Father and the Son, and through the Son to the Holy Spirit)... One God, the Father; one Lord, His Only-Begotten Son; one Holy Spirit, the Paraclete. And let these things suffice for us to know; but do not curiously scrutinize the nature or the substance (φύσιν ἢ ὑπόστασιν). For if it were written, we would say it; what is not written, let us not dare to assert. It suffices for our salvation to know that there is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit."

In these final clauses Cyril, as the Fathers very frequently, is arguing against the Eunomians, inquisitors into the divine essence, who boasted that they had perfect knowledge of it "as it is in itself," from syllogisms and philosophical principles about the simplicity of being (see De Deo Uno, Thesis X). From these very words, however, Langen infers what we said—that only the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit are proposed by Cyril as the object of faith (p. 30).

Therefore, all those things about the communication of the divine nature which from the Scriptures he proposed to catechumens, Cyril himself would immediately subvert; and—what is truly remarkable—those things which in the former period he proposed as to be believed because they are contained in Scripture, in the latter he would say are not to be believed because they are not written. But we may rest secure that such absurdities are not to be found in the holy Father; those "things not to be believed and not written" are nothing other than Eunomian philosophizings about comprehending the divine essence "as it is in itself" (223). Gregory Nazianzen, as Langen testifies, on one side—because of the multiple controversies of that age—adhering strictly to the Scriptures concerning the Holy Spirit, intended to propose nothing except doctrine altogether indubitable (p. 55); on the other side, "he could not withdraw from the common conception" (224) according to which "the persons, in the order in which they are numbered, depend one upon another" (p. 56). Hence Gregory teaches: "The Father cannot endure being deprived of the Son, nor the Son of the Holy Spirit" (225) (Or. 33, 17); "it is an unjust division if I separate either the Son from the Father or the essence of the Spirit from the Son" (Or. 40, 42); "if there was a time when the Father was not, there was also (a time) when the Son was not; if there was a time when the Son was not, there was also (a time) when the Holy Spirit was not" (Or. 31, 4); "it would never have been fitting that the Son be lacking to the Father or the Spirit to the Son... 'All

223 Gregor konnte sich von der gewöhnlichen Vorstellung nicht losmachen.

224 Οὐκ ἀνέχεται πατὴρ υἱὸν ζημιούμενος, οὐδὲ υἱὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.

225 Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔπρεπεν ἐλλείπειν ποτὲ ἢ υἱὸν πατρὶ ἢ πνεῦμα υἱῷ... πάντα ὅσα ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ υἱοῦ, πλὴν τῆς ἀγεννησίας· πάντα ὅσα ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πνεύματος, πλὴν τῆς γεννήσεως.

that the Father has' are the Son's, except ingenerateness; 'all that the Son has' are the Holy Spirit's, except generation" (226) (Or. 41, 9; cf. Or. 34, 10). Although all likenesses are deficient, nevertheless certain images of the Trinity are brought forward: "eye, spring, river" (ὀφθαλμός, πηγή, ποταμός); "sun, ray, light" (ἥλιος, ἀκτίς, φῶς; Or. 31, 31–32). Langen also recites all these things, admitting—what, moreover, is evident—that they are the common, twin doctrine of the other Fathers. Nor is it true, as Langen supposes (p. 55), that Gregory, in view of the Pneumatomachi who asserted the creation of the Spirit "through the Son," was cautious of the expression—"which," he says, "is not found in Scripture"—"that the Spirit proceeds through the Son"; for we have seen (above, against Macarius, p. 160) this very unanimous judgment of the Fathers expressly repeated by Gregory: "From the Father, through the Son, the divinity stands forth in the great Spirit."

Now, after all these things, the Bonn disputant suddenly and, as it were, from an abrupt turn, concludes that, in the great perturbation of his age regarding the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, Gregory held as the one thing dogmatically certain that the Holy

---

226 In all those places Augustine has nothing else than a catechetical explanation of the article in the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the Holy Spirit," and he focuses chiefly on the truths impugned by the heretics of that age; nonetheless, when the topic of the relative names comes up, he explains to catechumens (Serm. III, n. 9): "Pater non est Filius, sed Pater Filii; Filius non est Pater, sed Filius est Patris; Spiritus Sanctus nec Pater est nec Filius, sed Spiritus est Patris et Filii." Even more explicitly he says the same in the third sermon on the handing-back of the Creed (Serm. 214, n. 10): "credimus in Spiritum Sanctum de Patre procedentem nec tamen Filium; super Filium manentem, nec tamen Filii patrem; de Filii accipientem, nec tamen Filii filium; sed Spiritum Patris et Filii... Haec fides imbuat corda vestra et confessionem dirigat; hoc audiendo credite, ut intelligatis."

Spirit is consubstantial with the Father and the Son, and a hypostasis subsisting in its own right of the one Deity; and he asserts this after saying a little earlier that Gregory had the fixed purpose to teach nothing about the Holy Spirit except what is altogether certain and contained in Scripture—and that this same Gregory in many places taught the common judgment concerning the relation of the third person to the second, that is, to the first person through the second.

Hilary (Langen testifies) held the judgment that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, and that the Spirit receives all things from the Son, as most certain; and yet Hilary himself acknowledged that, for what is properly called the Church's doctrine, it suffices to profess the divinity of the Holy Spirit. The proof of this marvelous distinction found in Hilary runs as follows. "Hilary says" (De Trinitate XII, 56) "that Paul deemed it a sufficient indication about the Holy Spirit that he called Him 'the Spirit of the Father'; wherefore Hilary adds that he too, just as concerning the Son he wishes to say nothing except that He is 'begotten,' so concerning the Spirit he wishes to say nothing except that He is 'the Spirit of the Father'" (p. 27). This is the whole of what Langen thinks sufficient to demonstrate that Hilary distinguished his certain judgment about the procession of the Holy Spirit from what is properly called the doctrine of the Church!

Augustine—our adversary freely admitting it—expressly and in many places (see De Trinitate, Thesis XXXV) declared the doctrine of the procession "from the Father and the Son as from one principle" to be indisputably certain and contained in Sacred Scripture. But our theologian discovers that this profession is not everywhere urged and required by the holy Doctor, but that (in De fide et symbolo 16, 20; De agone Christiano 15 sqq.; De symbolo ad catechumenos Serm. I, 13; III, 9) there is only a mention of faith in

one God and three consubstantial persons (227). In the Enchiridion c. 9 he declares that we must believe that God is Trinity—namely, the Father and the Son begotten of the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeding from the same Father (228)—but (that He is) one and the same Spirit of the Father and of the Son. Langen also deems it noteworthy that Augustine there (c. 56) merely mentions "faith in the Holy Spirit as the third person of the Trinity" (229). Whence the interpreter of Bonn concludes as follows: "From these texts (which he

227 The Maurists note that in two Vatican manuscripts the reading is: ab eodem Patre et Filio procedentem. Langen says the falsity of this reading appears from the words that follow in Augustine's text, sed unum eundemque Spiritum Patris et Filii. On the contrary, if one were to argue from internal considerations, the following words and Augustine's manner of arguing, known from elsewhere, would persuade that the Vatican reading is the true one. For the holy doctor says: licet a duobus procedat, non tamen duo sunt procedentes, sed unus idemque Spiritus Patris et Filii. In the same way he argues Contra Maximinum, l. II, c. 14, n. 1: "Spiritus Sanctus ab utroque procedit, sicut iam ostendimus; unde et Spiritus Patris dictus est (Rom. VIII, 11), et Spiritus Filii (Rom. VIII, 9); non enim duo sunt Spiritus Sancti, tamquam singuli singulorum, sed unus potius Patris et Filii."

228 St. Augustine there recites the words of the Apostles' Creed and bids one attend to the order among the individual articles; from which you cannot tell what the Professor wanted to wrench out. Here are Augustine's words: "cum autem de Iesu Christo Filio Dei unico Domino nostro, quod ad brevitatem confessionis pertinet, dixerimus, adiungimus sic (al. ut scis), credere nos et in Spiritum Sanctum, ut illa Trinitas compleatur, quae Deus est; deinde de sancta commemoratur Ecclesia etc."

229 "De Patre procedens"—namely, in the manner he had said in that very place and a little earlier in the Symbol, and which he soon below again declares—just as, notably among the African Fathers Augustine and Fulgentius (cf. Tract. de Trin., ed. 2, p. 508), procession "from the Father" is always understood insofar as the Father and the Son are one in spiration.

has set out and which we have just described) we come to the conclusion that Augustine held the procession 'from the Father and the Son' as a certain doctrine founded in Scripture, yet did not count it among the handed-on doctrine of faith—among explicit faith—which he restricted to the simple profession of consubstantial persons in one Deity. He judged that this included the doctrine that the Holy Spirit is as much the Spirit of the Father as of the Son—a judgment which he himself held as equivalent to the profession of procession 'from the Father and the Son'" (p. 76).

Vigilius of Thapsus entitles Book VIII against the Arians On the Unity of Faith—namely, as the context shows, on the unity of divinity in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit—which, in Catholic faith, must be believed. After he has spoken of the divinity of the Son—who is "God from God," not "two Gods," "power from power," but "one power"—he treats of the Holy Spirit, "who must be believed to be neither unbegotten nor begotten nor a creature, but from the Father and the Son one power, one God." "As when two pieces of wood, joined together and cast into the furnace, produce from the two woods one undivided flame, so from the power of the Father and the Son proceeds the Holy Spirit, possessing the very power of the Godhead." There follows in Vigilius a little book of faith which is nothing other than a creed of Catholic profession: "I believe in God the Father almighty, and in the Only-Begotten Jesus Christ our Savior, and I confess that the Holy Spirit is one God... The true Father begot the true Son... And (I believe) the Holy Spirit to be true God, not unbegotten nor begotten, not created nor made, but proceeding from the Father and the Son, always coeternal in the Father and the Son." An exposition of Catholic faith is subjoined to the creed, which makes up Book X. The principal aim of the exposition is to demonstrate to the Arians the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; and in this demonstration of one Deity the

immanent relations of origin of the persons and the communication of nature are always kept before the eyes as the foundation. Among other things about the Holy Spirit there are words which Langen abuses: "If you believed the Scriptures of the Lord or the Lord speaking, you would never compare the Creator (the Spirit) to creatures, since you have read: 'By the word of the Lord the heavens were established, and by the Spirit of his mouth all their power' (Ps 32:6)... And the Lord in the Gospel says to the Apostles: 'I will send you from my Father the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth; he proceeds from the Father, and he has received of mine' (John 15:26; 16:14). This alone would indeed suffice for the faithful to believe—that the Son is begotten and that the Spirit, proceeding from the Father, is (230)—the kind and magnitude of which procession no one is granted to know, just as it is said of the Son: 'Who shall declare his generation?' (Acts 8:33)." After this Vigilius sets in opposition (Book XI) the Arian profession and the Catholic confession: "The Arians say that the Son and the Holy Spirit are shut out from the secrets of the Father... I (with Catholic confession) believe the Son in the Father and the Father in the Son; I also believe the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete —who proceeds from the Father—to be both the Son's and the Father's, because He also proceeds from the Son, as it is written in the Gospel that He gave His breath to His disciples—the Holy Spirit [cf. above against Macarius, pp. 63 sqq.]... And that this same Spirit is the Son's, we have proved by many testimonies of Scripture; and that He remains wholly in the Son; and that just as He proceeds from God

230 These remarks concern the Pneumatomachi's constant cavil: Why is the Spirit not the Son, if He proceeds from the substance of the Father and the Son? To this question other Fathers also are accustomed to reply by appealing to the incomprehensibility of the divine relations (Tract. de Trin., p. 433).

the Father, so He proceeds from the Son, so that the whole Trinity may be believed to be one God" (Migne 62, 287–301).

By all this Langen is not moved at all; he seizes on the words torn from the context, "This would suffice for the faithful to believe, because the Spirit is proceeding from the Father," and takes them as proof that Vigilius did not reckon the procession "from the Father and the Son" to belong to symbolic doctrine ([231]), perhaps having regard, as he says, to the Constantinopolitan Creed. But what kind of monstrosity is this? Does he merely want to say that in the time of Vigilius the explication by the particle Filioque had not yet been inserted into the formula of the Constantinopolitan Creed; or does he assert that Vigilius did not recognize this as the genuine sense of the Creed? Everyone knows the first—but it is irrelevant and beside the aim of the Bonn disputation; Vigilius himself refutes the second, since in his "little book of faith," that is, his more explicit creed, and in the opposition of the "Catholic confession" against the Arian profession, he expressly proposes as to be believed the procession as much "from the Father" as "from the Son."

These are all the Fathers upon whom the Reinkensian actor wished to try his ἐπίκρισις—if we set aside Origen, whose doctrine on the Holy Spirit, although most express when only the origin "from the Son" is considered, it neither pleases us nor is it necessary for us to examine now (see De Trinitate, ed. 2, pp. 489–490). I judge, however, that the very arrangement of the Langenian arguments which we have faithfully described may of itself suffice in place of a refutation, so that it is not necessary to pursue each point and erase every subterfuge.

The Fathers frequently propose and explain the one Deity in three distinct persons from the internal processions themselves—or from the communication of essence. How then can it be deduced,

---

[231] Als symbolisch hat Vigilius das Filioque nicht behandelt.

from the fact that at times they require the faith of the divinity and consubstantiality of the persons without explicitly mentioning the processions themselves, that the procession of the Holy Spirit did not belong to Christian faith? With exactly the same right, from that affirmation of the divinity and consubstantiality of the persons you would deduce that the generation of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Father" did not belong to Christian faith. How, from the fact that Basil and Cyril teach that the very faith in the unity of nature in three distinct persons is to be professed in such a way that it is to be believed that the essence is communicated from the Father to the Only-Begotten, and from the Father through the Only-Begotten to the Holy Spirit, does it not evidently follow that this very foundation of unity and distinction is to be believed by faith? How, from the fact that Gregory Nazianzen had it fixed to propose nothing about the Holy Spirit but dogmas certain and contained in Scripture, does it not necessarily follow that he reckoned among doctrines of faith the teaching which he so frequently set forth concerning the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son? How, from the fact that in opposition to the arguments of the heretics who asserted that the Holy Spirit is a creature of the Son, the Fathers appeal to the appellation "Spirit of the Father," will our disputant conclude that the appellation "Spirit of the Son" has less force—since both have the same author, the Apostle Paul? How, from the fact that it is proposed as to be believed that the Spirit is "of the Father and of the Son"—a phrase which, from the very signification of the words, and from the common explication of the Fathers, and (as regards Augustine) from Langen's own confession, was understood as "breathed forth," that is, proceeding by spiration from the Father and the Son—will anyone ever be persuaded that those words of Scripture were to be believed, but the sense expressed by those words and understood by the Fathers was not and is not to be believed? How, from the fact that by the

African Fathers, although the particle Filioque was not expressed in the Constantinopolitan Creed, nevertheless the origin of the Holy Spirit "from the Father and the Son" was expressly opposed to the Arians as "Catholic confession," is it not to be admitted that this was absolutely what it is called—namely, Catholic confession? Finally, what, pray, is this "explicit faith" which Augustine is said to have restricted to the simple consubstantiality of the persons in one Deity, while at the same time he held the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Father and the Son" to be revealed in the Scriptures themselves? Was the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit "from the Father" also excluded from explicit faith? If this be affirmed, then neither did the numerical unity of the Deity pertain to explicit faith, and the Tritheists, professing a simple consubstantiality of the persons in one (specific) deity, would not be heretics against explicit faith. If they do not dare to assert so great an absurdity—and therefore if not the simple "consubstantiality" alone but also its foundation, namely the communication of nature or procession of the persons, equally belonged to the Church's explicit faith—how, I ask, is this true of the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Father" but not "from the Son," since Augustine and all the other Fathers, by reason of the very consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, held the procession of the Spirit "from both as one and the same," equally revealed in the Scriptures? Moreover, if what is said about "explicit faith" merely means that before the rise of the Photian heresy the procession "from the Father and the Son" had not yet been declared by a formal definition of the Church and had not been defended polemically—"since no calumniator was then pressing"—yet that it was in the deposit of faith to be guarded and expounded, this whole point may be readily conceded. But two consequences follow—already mentioned above—which overturn the whole Bonn construction. First, that at the time when the opposing heresy had already begun "to

trouble the Church" and to bring the deposit of faith into peril, the revealed truth could and should have been declared by a formal definition of the Church, the guardian of the deposit, and defended by more urgent preaching. Second, that although in that earlier stage of simple faith material error without formal heresy could more easily have found a place, it is nonetheless now manifest heresy to think and to teach against the Church's definition and urgent preaching—not only in the way in which the ancient Eastern Photians deny that the truth of the doctrine is contained in the dogma of the Catholic Church, but also in the way in which the new Photians of Bonn deny that a dogma of faith is contained in the truth of the doctrine: it is heresy not only to deny that in a defined dogma of faith there is truth, but also to deny that in a defined truth there is a dogma of faith.

§ VII.
A Synthesis of the Entire "Langenian" Inquiry Composed by the Author Himself

The Bonn theologian brings his investigation to a close with a concise synthesis of his whole doctrine, a kind of recapitulation, in which the theses—made more striking by their very brevity—cause all but incredible contradictions to stand out the more clearly. It will therefore be worth the effort to transcribe this recapitulation in full, so that the character of the entire booklet may be taken in, as it were, at a glance. He concludes his inquiry at § 32. I shall recite the author's very words, which—especially after the animadversions already supplied—hardly require commentary. Receive, then, this Neo-Photian peroration.

1° "There is and can be no dogma except this one alone: that the Holy Spirit has His essence from the Father, and therefore has the same essence with the Father and the Son; for only this doctrine is

contained definitively in the New Testament and is confirmed by the unanimous tradition of faith (232) of the Eastern and Western Church."

2° "Equally unanimous was the theological tradition in the ancient Church (233), and accordingly the profession passed into the very symbols of faith that, by reason of the unity of the divine essence (in the Father and the Son), the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son."

We have already demonstrated that the procession from the Son no less than from the Father is taught both explicitly in the words of Christ and the Apostles and implicitly revealed, and thus contained in the doctrine of consubstantiality and of the relations of the divine Persons, to be explained by the magisterium, the guardian of the deposit. We have likewise demonstrated—and it is in itself also well known—the fact of this explanation in the universal preaching of the Church, both before and, more urgently still, after the rise of the contrary heresy. Furthermore, we have seen that the direct tradition of the dogma in the testimony and teaching of all the Fathers is so clear that scarcely any other dogma—considering the stage at which defense against heretics was not yet necessary—has clearer and fuller attestation. These things need not now be repeated; only the statements of the Reinkensian theologian must be compared with one another. First he asserts that the tradition of faith contains only the procession from the Father, and not also the procession from the Son, or from the Father through the Son. Then—apparently terrified by the universal consent of all Catholic antiquity, which he himself had been forced to acknowledge in his inquiry—he immediately adds that

---

232 "Unanimous tradition of faith."

233 "Likewise unanimous theological tradition in the ancient Church."

the theological tradition concerning the procession from the Father through the Son is equally unanimous. We are therefore bidden to believe that the doctrine in question is not contained in the tradition of faith, yet is contained in the unanimous theological tradition of the ancient Church, and even expressed in the symbols of faith. I ask, then: what in the end is this unanimous "theological tradition"? The Fathers of every age and of every Church set forth the doctrine of the internal relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son—a doctrine which can be known only from divine revelation; they set it forth as certain no less than the unity and communication of nature in the distinct Persons; they declare expressly that it is stated in revelation and in the words of Christ; they either attest that it is proposed to catechumens in the symbol throughout the whole Church as to be believed (as Epiphanius), or they place it in their own professions of the Catholic faith (as Gregory Thaumaturgus, Marius Victorinus, Vigilius of Tapsus, Gennadius, Tarasius, the Roman Diurnum in the consecration of Roman Pontiffs already from Gregory the Great, the Councils of Toledo, the English under Theodore, the Council of Forum Julii under Paulinus, Aachen, Worms), or they have it in the symbols universally received (as the Athanasian in the Western Church long before Photius; the "symbol of the orthodox faith" sent by Leo III to all the Eastern Churches), or they place it in express words among the articles of the Catholic faith to be believed of necessity (Hilary, Fulgentius, Leo III, and equivalently all the rest). From this stage of universal ecclesiastical preaching, when as yet no calumniator was pressing, the dogma, once the need of defense had arisen, passed into a confession directly opposed to the heresy, into a symbol as an explanation of the true sense of the procession from the Father, into a formal definition with anathema of the contrary heresy (see above § III). If Langen calls this "unanimous theological tradition," that is indeed most true—provided that one understands

the theology of the Church, which is itself the authentic explanation and tradition of the faith; nor does there exist any other unanimous "theological tradition" of the Church even with respect to the procession from the Father itself, which Langen admits to be the tradition of faith. The opposition, therefore, which he posits between the tradition of faith concerning the procession from the Father and the unanimous theological tradition concerning the procession from the Father through the Son, involves a contradiction. But to affirm that this tradition is not the theology of the Church, and nevertheless that it is the unanimous tradition of all the Fathers in the manner we have seen, is a prodigious absurdity. Let us now go on to the remaining "turns" of the argument.

3º "At the beginning the formula 'from the Father and the Son' still had the sense of the traditional doctrine 'through the Son.' But Augustine introduced into it the view that the Holy Spirit proceeds in an equal manner from the Father and the Son, under this restriction, however: that the procession from the Son is understood to have its root also in the Father as the one primordial principle of the whole divine life. In this way there obtained no essential difference—one that modifies the doctrine of God—between the Augustinian Filioque and the Greek formula διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ('through the Son')."

What marvel is this? We are told that, at first, the two formulas—"from the Father and the Son" and "from the Father through the Son"—had one and the same sense; afterwards Augustine introduced a different sense into the former. This different sense supposedly lies in this: that the Spirit is said to proceed in an equal manner from the Father and the Son; whence it follows that before Augustine all the Fathers—and even after him those who said that the procession is "from the Father through the Son"—believed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from each in a different manner: in one way

from the Father and in another way from the Son. Lest you think that Langen speaks of this "different way" of procession in an improper sense, intending only to say that the spirative power is in the unbegotten Father "of Himself" and incommunicable, whereas in the begotten Son it is communicated by the Father through generation—do not think this, I say; for Langen himself warns us that this notion of the "primordial principle" in the Father alone was understood by Augustine and was included in his own formula "from the Father and the Son," as indeed we have seen the holy Doctor inculcate everywhere. Therefore the change of sense which Augustine is said to have introduced cannot be understood as consisting in this: that the traditional formula "from the Father through the Son," and before Augustine even the formula "from the Father and the Son," signified the Father as the primordial principle and the Son as begotten with a spirative power received from the Father; for this very thing, by Langen's own admission, is what Augustine intended in teaching in his formula that the Spirit proceeds in an equal manner from the Father and the Son. Consequently, the "different manner" of procession from the Father and from the Son—which, according to Langen, was believed before Augustine and was not admitted by Augustine—must necessarily be understood as a different spiration in the Father and a different spiration in the Son; and we have seen that Langen sometimes calls this a "participation of spiration," sometimes a "passing through" the Son. Nor is the fable yet ended. After so much ματαιολογία about the difference between the sense in which the procession "through the Son" and "from the Son" was understood before Augustine, and the different sense which Augustine is said to have introduced, he ends by concluding that this difference between the two senses is not essential.

Yet in truth, if it was previously believed that there is one spiration in the Father and another in the Son, such a doctrine is

either Arian or tritheistic, and at the same time it entails two Holy Spirits—which absurdity Augustine reproaches as "each (Spirit) from each (Person)"; thus the difference would be most essential. But if, as the truth has it, by the name of the procession "from the Father through the Son" in the Catholic sense there was understood the one numerically identical spiration of the Father communicated to the Son, this same sense is often and clearly stated by Augustine; and therefore everything Langen argues about a diversity of sense in the two formulas is pure fiction, introduced to obscure—if that were possible—the unanimous consent of the Fathers, both Eastern and Western (see above § II). Receive, and patiently endure, the remaining Langenian assertions.

4° "Just as it cannot be said that the Augustinian doctrine of the procession 'from the Father and the Son' introduces in God two principles, or αἰτίας προκαταρκτικάς, so the theologians in the kingdom of the Franks (under Charlemagne) wrongly suspected the formula διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ('through the Son') as if it were contrary to the divinity of the Holy Spirit."

5° "Neither the one doctrine ('from the Father through the Son') nor the other ('from the Father and the Son') can be considered heretical, provided that the defenders of each retain both the unity and the consubstantiality of the three Persons in God. Even the doctrine introduced later (234), namely that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone and not from the Son, whether through the Son or not, is not itself heretical, insofar as its patrons are able, given this way of conceiving matters, to retain the divine unity; nevertheless this doctrine seems to run into difficulties not only speculative but

234 "The later-arising doctrine."

even greater ones from tradition, because it was foreign to the ancient ecclesiastical theology" (235).

Again the investigator divides into two the one and only doctrine—that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, or from the Father through the Son—yet he graciously concedes that neither of the two is heretical. Thus a doctrine revealed in Scripture, explained in Catholic tradition, explicitly defined against the opposing heresy, and proposed in a solemn symbol by the universal Church as an article of faith to be explicitly believed by all, is, for these men who dogmatize, worth no more than the contrary error; for the Photian negation is straightway placed on the same footing, since this too, they say, is not heretical. Moreover, to say that a doctrine which, as we have said, is thus set in the preaching and tradition, and is acknowledged to have been introduced later and to be foreign to ancient ecclesiastical theology—and which brings into jeopardy the very consubstantiality of the Father and the Son—is not heretical, can be affirmed only by the "veteratores," who, once all Catholic principles have been overthrown, will pronounce no error heretical any longer. At last we have come to the unraveling of the knot of this fable, as follows.

6º "Accordingly," he says, "by the added word Filioque there was inserted into the symbol not, indeed, a heretical doctrine, but nevertheless a theological opinion which, because of this very terse expression, could be misunderstood—as though two principles were being established in God.

"As to the juridical form, that enlargement of the ecumenical symbol of faith was therefore illegitimate, because it could have been

---

235 "But this doctrine would have to contend not only with speculative objections, but still more with the traditional one, namely that it was foreign to the theology of the ancient Church."

decreed only by an ecumenical council; yet at the time when it was introduced, the controversy about the dogmatic truth of the addition was already raging, and it was being used by one part of the Church as a weapon against the other part."

7° "From the fact that the entire Western Church for several centuries had this addition in the symbol of faith, no formal right could be acquired for it. Wherefore it would be desirable for Western Christians to drop the addition once more, without meanwhile changing their present theological view of the Trinity ([236]). By the rejection of that inserted particle the as-yet insuperable impediment between the Churches of East and West would be removed, and then the remaining disagreements could easily be smoothed away. Nor would it be necessary for Westerners to depart from their theological view; for what is said by the word Filioque, even if it be understood according to Augustine's theory, contains no heresy; indeed the formula admits an interpretation by which it is composed as if identical with the other expression of the Greeks, διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ('through the Son')."

"If Hadrian I took up the defense of the formula διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ, and Leo III did not wish the word Filioque to be inserted into the symbol; if, conversely, Maximus the Confessor did not disapprove the word Filioque as merely another expression for the formula διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ, and Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, took the confession διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ into his very symbol of faith; there is no reason to despair that, even after a thousand years of dissension, reconciliation will at last follow."

---

[236] "It would therefore be desirable that Western Christendom should once more drop the addition, without, however, changing its present theological conception of the Trinity."

Here we have not only the piled-up Neo-Photian suppositions by which the very principles of the Catholic faith are subverted, but over and above that a certain heap of manifest contradictions. It is supposed that the universal Church can err—and did err for many centuries—in the very definition and profession of the articles of faith; and thus that it can fall into—and did fall into—heresy, which is incurred not only by professing something false, but equally by defining and proposing as revealed truth what is not revealed. Hence it is supposed that, contrary to the Church of Jesus Christ, the gates of hell can prevail—and did prevail; that the Church can perish—and did perish many ages ago. If the "veteratores" should say that these suppositions are imputed to them unjustly, such a denial would be so only because at the first establishment of their sect they

had already forsworn the very notion of the infallible and indefectible Church of Christ (237).

From the same perversion of the notion of the Church there arises a second supposition: that the Photians and, consequently, all the other sects—even though they deny, and condemn as heresy, a defined article of faith—nonetheless constitute a part of the true Church. What we said above in § I must be repeated concerning these matters; here we shall very briefly touch upon the contradictions in Langen's diatribe.

---

237 "The pseudo-bishop of the 'veteratores,' Hubert Reinkens, in his pastoral letters, by which he commended himself as a Catholic bishop separated from the Roman Pontiff and from all the bishops of the whole world (11 August 1873), did not hesitate, without circumlocution, to proclaim that the legitimate episcopate, and consequently the Church, had perished many ages ago, and that he now is the restorer of the legitimate episcopate. He complains that the apostolic legitimacy of the bishops has been overthrown. 'If the holy Fathers should rise again now,' he says, 'they would recognize as legitimate the election of none among all the bishops of the Roman Church now living, not even of the very bishop of the city of Rome.' He says that the overthrow of the apostolic constitution of the episcopate, begun in the sixth century, was finally completed in the ninth century, and is now sanctioned as a pretended dogma. 'Since now the Roman Pontiff and the bishops subject to him as to their Lord have utterly overthrown the divinely established constitution, and, moreover, have corrupted the word of God—Scripture and Tradition being despised—by human inventions ... we have at last been constrained to recall the apostolic form of election to restore the episcopate.' Then are enumerated many errors in which the Pontiff, together with all the bishops united to him, is said to be involved, and the Apostolic See of Rome to be vacant; out of this universal perdition those alone ('the veteratores') are saved who have listened to the voice of the Lord calling individuals to free examination in matters of faith and morals."

a) To propose in a symbol, as an article of revealed faith, a merely theological opinion not contained in the deposit of revelation is, by divine law, unlawful, nor can it be done without heresy. But, since the Spirit of Truth—abiding forever—was promised and sent to the magisterium of the Church in teaching and to the universal Church in believing, therefore the admission and profession of any article in an ecumenical symbol is an infallible and altogether most luminous argument that it is not "merely a theological opinion," but a truth revealed, to be believed with divine faith. The right and authority to propose revealed truths in the symbol do not differ from the right to define the truths of faith; and this does not differ from the right authentically to teach the universal Church. That right, therefore, and that right alone—the divinely bestowed right to propose, for the universal Church, revealed truths in the symbol—belongs to those to whom there is divinely enjoined the right and the office of authentically teaching the universal Church. But after the Apostles, this right and office was given to no one except to the visible Rock, the confirmer of the brethren, the shepherd of the whole Church of Christ—considered either in Himself in relation to the whole Church, to the brotherhood that is in the world, to the universality of the sheep to be sustained, confirmed, and fed: "Upon this rock I will build my Church"; "but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not" (in that office to which the injunction is annexed), "and thou, when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren; feed my sheep, feed my lambs"—or considered together with His Head and under His Head in apostolic succession, that is, the whole teaching Church, whether dispersed or assembled and represented in an ecumenical council: "the Spirit of Truth, that He may abide with you forever"; "and behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the age"; "and He gave ... pastors and teachers for the perfecting of the saints unto the work of the ministry, unto the

edification of the Body of Christ, until we all meet into the unity of faith"; "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." This whole divine institution is subverted, the work of Christ the Redeemer and Founder is undone, the preaching is vain and the faith of the Church is vain, if (as the "veteratores" dare to say) by the admission of an article of faith into the ecumenical symbol by the whole teaching Church—and retained for many centuries and professed solemnly by the whole Church—not only is no legitimate right shown as to form, but neither does it stand fast as to matter that it is a revealed truth; rather, a mere opinion, which may with impunity be denied, was illegitimately thrust among the articles of faith to be believed on pain of anathema and by all the faithful explicitly believed. What is said about the controversy that was already raging at the time of the admission of the article into the symbol is absurd. This "controversy" was nothing other than the contradiction of the Photian heretics, from which there arose—just as happens in most other definitions of faith—the necessity of a more explicit declaration and a more insistent preaching, and to this end the very clause "who proceeds from the Father," in the Constantinopolitan symbol, received the Catholic explanation, repeated from Scripture and from the whole unanimous Tradition.

b) Two mutually contradictory proposals, patched together, are further added, the meaning of which one does not know how to take. "Let Western Christians," he says, "cast out from the symbol the profession that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son," and at the same time "let them retain their theological view." If he means those heretics who have no articles of divine faith irreformable, but only opinions to be exchanged for others as occasion requires—these have, by that very fact, no symbol of faith, but at best a kind of series of religious opinions. They, then, will readily agree with the Veteran society, not founded on some common

positive confession but on the negation of faith—provided the whole symbol of faith is cast away, not only this one article. But if they mean the Catholic Church—which, for the rest, is not circumscribed by boundaries and does not consist of Western Christians alone—and think that "it ought both to retain its theological view," which is nothing other than the unchangeable divine faith in the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, and at the same time to reject, from the census of the articles of faith, the truth defined and believed, then indeed they conjoin affirmation and negation of the same thing under the same aspect. As for Hadrian I, Leo III, Maximus, and Tarasius: all of them, although the explanation had not yet been inserted into the Constantinopolitan symbol itself and at that time the necessity of inserting it did not appear, professed one and the same faith in the procession "from the Father and the Son" or "through the Son." For Langen now at last himself admits that, according to some interpretation (as he says), the two formulas declare one and the same thing—which interpretation is, and can be, no other than the Catholic interpretation, sanctioned anew in the ecumenical Council of Florence (see above § II).

Finally, the smoothing of the path to unity among Christians is not accomplished by the negation of doctrine of faith or by dissimulation. Such dissimulation is employed by men who have already "made shipwreck concerning the faith," inventing for themselves a certain appearance of a Church—so called by them—that, with internal dissensions of affirmations and negations, presents the image not of the Church of Christ but of that "land of darkness where there is no order, but everlasting horror dwells." The unity of the Church can subsist in the integrity of the faith of truth alone: "careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; one body and one Spirit … one Lord, one faith" (Eph. 4:3). But the path to this unity of integral truth and faith is open by no other way than that

constructed by the very Author and Perfecter of faith, Jesus, through the charisma of the Spirit of Truth in His Church. Therefore, since such evidences abound, we ought not still to seek the truth from others, which it is easy to draw from the Church, since the Apostles, as if into a rich treasury, have most fully poured into her everything that pertains to the truth, in order that everyone who wishes may take from her the drink of life. "And the preaching of the Church is true and sure, in which one and the same way of salvation is shown throughout the whole world. For to her has been entrusted the light of God, and on account of this, the wisdom of God, through which she saves all men.... Those, therefore, who leave the preaching of the Church, accuse the ignorance of the holy Presbyters, not considering how much more the religious simple-minded man is worth than the blaspheming and shameless sophist. And such are all heretics ... who, not always holding the same opinions about the same things, are blind men led about by blind men; justly shall they fall into the hidden pit of ignorance, always seeking and never finding the truth. We must therefore flee their opinions, and take refuge in the Church, and be brought up in her bosom and nourished by the Lord's Scriptures" (St Irenaeus, III.4; V.20). What both the ancient schismatics, torn from the Catholic Church, and the new apostates should taste and understand, the Holy Spirit alone—by His grace—can bring about, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, Lord and Life-giver.

A.M.D.G.

On the Procession of the Holy Spirit

In this rigorous and luminous supplement to De Deo Trino, Card. Johannes Baptist Franzelin, S.J.—the Roman College's master of dogma and one of the nineteenth century's most exacting theologians—enters the contested ground of the procession of the Holy Spirit. With Jesuit precision, Roman clarity, and a heart formed by the Fathers, Franzelin confronts the Photian claim that the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, and unfolds the Catholic confession that He proceeds from the Father and the Son.

The book opens with a searching examination of Bishop Macarius Bulgakov's hermeneutics, testing his appeal to Scripture by close exegesis of John 15:26 and 20:22, the relation of mission to procession, and the title "Spirit of the Son." From there Franzelin exposes the sleights of hand by which the Photian thesis is allegedly grounded in creeds and councils, weighing the Eastern synods, the Councils of Toledo and Aachen, and the voice of both Greek and Latin Fathers. He patiently distinguishes genuine patristic consensus from selective citation, showing how East and West converge on one and the same mystery: distinction without division, origin without inequality, communion without confusion.

Franzelin then turns to the Creed's profession and to charges leveled against Catholic theologians—answering allegations of textual corruption and clarifying the doctrinal development that undergirds the Filioque. A substantial Scholion responds to the "Neo-Photian" proposals of Joseph Langen, correcting misreadings of Scripture and Tradition with exacting documentation and serene theological judgment.

Contained in this Volume:

Preface • Prologue • Examination of Marcarius • Scholia on Joseph Langen

OpenAI Gpt-5

Machine Translation